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1NC—Debt Ceiling Good DA

Debt ceiling passes now—but can be easily interrupted

Wall Street Journal 7-5 (“A Debt-Limit Breakout,” Wall Street Journal, 5 July 2011, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304803104576427852199681170.html?mod=googlenews_wsj>

As for the debt-limit politics, this is also a winner. Democrats and Republicans say they've agreed privately on sizable spending cuts over a 10-year budget window. No doubt some of those cuts are less real than others, and future Congresses could rewrite any enforcement provisions passed this year. But Republicans still have an incentive to set spending on a downward path, and Mr. Obama has an incentive to show he is no longer a hostage of Nancy Pelosi as he runs for re-election. The political sticking point is Mr. Obama's desire for some Republican buy-in on raising revenues. His political left is still sore that he agreed to extend the Bush tax rates through 2012. Thus he's pounding Republicans to agree to eliminate certain business tax deductions that political advisers David Axelrod and David Plouffe have told him will be hard for Republicans to defend. Corporate jets. Carried interest for private equity. Oil and gas. Even LIFO accounting, which few understand but can be made to sound nefarious. Whatever their individual merits, each of these would be a tax increase on business, and Republicans campaigned last year on not raising taxes. But the politics is different if they can offset these revenue raisers with lower tax rates. That would let Republicans honestly claim they didn't support a net tax increase, even as Mr. Obama could say he raised revenue. Our own guess is that such a reform would raise far more money than the official scorers would predict, since it would lead to a more efficient allocation of capital and less tax evasion. This would also promote economic growth, breaking out of the austerity mentality driven by debt reduction. If Mr. Obama really is worried that lower federal spending will hurt the economy, then this tax reform is also his best growth policy. In offering his grand bargain on Saturday, Mr. Clinton included the caveat of "how can they do that by August 2?" Mr. Geithner says that is the date when he can no longer finagle federal finances to escape a potential default on the debt, or must at least cut some federal spending, to avoid breaching the $14.3 trillion debt limit. But where there's political self-interest there's always a way. Both sides could agree to a short-term debt-limit reprieve of a month or two with some spending cuts that everyone agrees on. That would give them more time to cut a larger deal that includes corporate tax reform. Think about it. On the current path both sides are headed at best for a de minimis deal that makes everyone look bad, at worst for a major political crack-up. Perhaps Mr. Obama wants a crack-up to portray Republicans as extreme. But Republicans should at least call his bluff and answer his demands for fewer business tax deductions by saying yes—in return for lower tax rates.

<Insert link>

Failure to raise debt ceiling will kill financial markets globally

**Associated Press 6-26** (Ken Thomas. “Biden warns GOP on debt ceiling talks,” *Salon*, 6-26-11. < http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2011/06/26/us\_biden\_2012\_1> LV)

Republican leaders say without a deal cutting long-term deficits, they will not vote to increase the nation's borrowing -- which will exceed its $14.3 trillion limit on Aug. 2. The Obama administration has warned that if Congress fails to raise the debt ceiling, it would lead to the first U.S. financial default in history and roil financial markets around the globe.

Economic collapse causes global nuclear war

Mead, Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy @ CFR, 09 [Walter Russell, The New Republic, “Only Makes You Stronger”, 2/4, <http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=2>]

If current market turmoil seriously damaged the performance and prospects of India and China, the current crisis could join the Great Depression in the list of economic events that changed history, even if the recessions in the West are relatively short and mild. The United States should stand ready to assist Chinese and Indian financial authorities on an emergency basis--and work very hard to help both countries escape or at least weather any economic downturn. It may test the political will of the Obama administration, but the United States must avoid a protectionist response to the economic slowdown. U.S. moves to limit market access for Chinese and Indian producers could poison relations for years. For billions of people in nuclear-armed countries to emerge from this crisis believing either that the United States was indifferent to their well-being or that it had profited from their distress could damage U.S. foreign policy far more severely than any mistake made by George W. Bush. […] Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

UQ—Will Pass

Debt ceiling reform will pass

**AFP ’11** (“Political theater clouds US debt ceiling vote,” *Activist Post*, 5-31-11. < http://www.activistpost.com/2011/05/political-theater-clouds-us-debt.html> LV)

Both Obama and Republicans have agreed on a figure of roughly four trillion dollars in budget cuts that they say is vital to reining in the deficit in the long-term and putting the economy on a sustainable path to fiscal prudence.

Debt ceiling will pass—GOP will trade

CNBC 7/5 (“The US Debt Problem Is Worse Than Greece,” http://www.cnbc.com/id/43639900)

LL: We have talked about political will for quite some time. Congress loves a good crisis in order to get things done. Are you confident something will get done? DA: There will be a deal. But it needs to be a good deal, or the grassroots will revolt. It’s in the Republicans’ interest to hold out for deep spending cuts and a strong balanced budget amendment. The tea party movement demonstrates that for the first time there is a voting constituency ready to support bold cuts to the budget. These folks are showing up at town halls and are chanting ‘we want less.’ The debt ceiling vote is an opportunity to finally make significant cuts and get out long term fiscal house in order.

UQ—Top of the Docket

Debt ceiling is top of the docket

NYT 7/5 (“Reid Cancels Libya Vote to Focus on Debt Limit Debate,” <http://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/07/05/reid-shifts-senate-attention-from-libya-to-debt-limit/>)

With Republicans protesting that the Senate should be concentrating on the debt limit standoff this week, Senator Harry Reid, the Nevada Democrat and majority leader, on Tuesday conceded the point and abruptly called off a planned debate on Libya. After a series of complaints by Republicans that their Fourth of July break had been canceled to deal with the debt limit fight and not Libya, Mr. Reid essentially threw in the towel and said the Senate would instead take nonbinding votes later this week on how to address the debt limit dispute. Republicans on Tuesday threatened to block consideration of the bipartisan resolution on Libya introduced two weeks ago, which would authorize United States military operations there, saying lawmakers should instead devote their energies to resolving the ongoing budget fight. Backers needed 60 votes to open debate on Libya, and may have come up short in a vote set for Tuesday evening. “We need to focus on the issue at hand,” said Senator Bob Corker, Republican of Tennessee. In an appearance on the Senate floor, Mr. Reid said: “Notwithstanding the broad support for the Libya resolution, **the most important thing to focus on** this week is the budget. Meetings are in process now and will continue on the debt limit and the larger debt matter throughout the Capitol.” His decision came as President Obama prepared to make new remarks on the debt fight Tuesday afternoon and Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, the Republican leader, reiterated his opposition to any budget deal containing new taxes. Mr. McConnell accused Democrats of a “cheap attempt” at making Republicans look bad by saying that Republicans refused to consider ending a tax break for corporate jets. “Apparently, they’d rather have fun trying to caricature their political opponents than they would working out a bipartisan solution that would actually enable us to balance the books,” he said. Renewing an invitation for President Obama to meet with Senate Republicans, Mr. McConnell said, “I think the best way to solve this impasse is for the president to hear what needs to be done, and how we can do it — hear what can actually pass here in Congress.” Senate Democratic leaders last week called off their planned Fourth of July break because of the Treasury Department’s approaching Aug. 2 deadline for raising the nation’s debt ceiling. But the talks aimed at resolving that dispute are occurring mainly off the floor in leadership offices and at the White House, so Mr. Reid scheduled the Libya resolution for floor debate.

IL—Republicans Key

Need Republicans to agree on taxes to pass debt ceiling reform

**Associated Press 6-26** (Ken Thomas. “Biden warns GOP on debt ceiling talks,” *Salon*, 6-26-11. < http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2011/06/26/us\_biden\_2012\_1> LV)

Addressing Ohio Democrats, Biden said there had been great progress in talks with Republican lawmakers on a deficit-reduction plan agreement. But he insisted that his party wouldn't agree to cuts that would undermine the elderly and middle-class workers. "We're not going to let the middle class carry the whole burden. We will sacrifice. But they must be in on the deal," Biden said in a speech at the Ohio Democratic Party's annual dinner. Biden led efforts on a deficit-reduction plan but Republicans pulled out of the discussions last week, prompting President Barack Obama to take control of the talks. The sides disagree over taxes. Democrats say a deficit-reduction agreement must include tax increases or eliminate tax breaks for big companies and wealthy individuals. Republicans want huge cuts in government spending and insist on no tax increases.

Republican approval key to raising debt ceiling

**MSNBC ’11** (John W. Schoen. “Debt ceiling brawl threatens economy, consumers,” *MSNBC*, 4-11-11. < http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/42536397/ns/business-eye\_on\_the\_economy/t/debt-ceiling-brawl-threatens-economy-consumers/> LV)

Raising the debt ceiling will require the approval of at least some Republicans in both the House and Senate. As the GOP plots strategy, its hard-line stand has strong voter backing.

IL—Political Capital Key

Obama political capital key to re-start debt ceiling talks

AP/The Huffington Post, 6/24/2011, “Obama, Boehner Held Secret Debt Ceiling Meeting At White House”, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/06/24/obama-boehner-debt-ceiling-talks\_n\_883707.html

Efforts to find a bipartisan agreement blending huge budget cuts with a must-pass measure to increase how much the government can borrow have entered a new phase after Republican negotiators pulled out of talks led by Vice President Joe Biden. The exit of House Majority Leader Eric Cantor from the talks on Thursday means the most difficult decisions have been kicked upstairs to GOP House Speaker John Boehner of Ohio and President Barack Obama. The Biden-led group had made solid progress in weeks of negotiations but was at an impasse over taxes. Cantor, R-Va., said that the Republican-dominated House simply won't support tax increases and that it's time for Obama to weigh in directly because Biden and Democrats were insisting on tax increases. Democrats said it's only fair to blend in additional revenues from closing tax breaks to balance trillions of dollars in spending cuts. It had long been assumed that the Biden group would set the stage for more decisive talks involving Obama and Boehner. As a result, Cantor's move was interpreted as trying to jump-start the talks rather than blow them up - a view shared by Cantor himself.

Obama focusing political capital on debt ceiling negotiations- key to passage

Daniel Strauss, 6/24/2011, “Obama looks to break debt impasse’, http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/168363-obama-to-meet-with-senate-leadership-to-discuss-debt-limit-negotiations

President Obama and Vice President Biden will meet with Senate leaders to discuss negotiations on raising the debt limit, the White House announced Friday. The meetings on Monday are intended to "to find common ground on a balanced approach to deficit reduction," the White House said. Obama and Biden will meet with Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) in the morning and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) in the evening. The announcement on Friday came shortly after House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) issued a statement saying he would not sign off on any deal to increase the debt limit that did not include spending cuts larger than the debt limit, budget reforms, and an increase in taxes. "With Republicans threatening to give up amidst internal divisions, Sen. Reid is prepared to step in and make sure we stay focused on creating jobs and cutting the deficit," Reid spokesman Adam Jentleson said in a statement. On Friday, White House press Secretary Jay Carney said Obama was confident that a deal would eventually be reached. "We believe that we can move forward as long as no one in the talks takes a my-way-or-the-highway approach," Carney said. Despite the appearance of an impasse, Carney said the White House remains "confident that we can continue the progress that we've made and that there's reason to believe that we'll be able to find common ground to achieve significant deficit reduction." "Because the American people insist that we get it done," Carney said. The White House announcement came a day after House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.) announced that he would not continue to participate in debt-ceiling negotiations led by Biden. Reid said that the departure of Cantor and Senate Minority Whip Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.) from the negotiations meant that finishing the deal was now up to the leaders of Congress and the president.

AT: Won’t Default

If debt ceiling is not raised, US will default on debt

**Witt ’11** (Ryan. “How the debt ceiling issue will start affecting Americans very soon,” *Examiner*, 5-12-11. < http://www.examiner.com/political-buzz-in-national/how-the-debt-ceiling-issue-will-start-affecting-americans-very-soon> LV)

Over the coming two months the Treasury Department will take more “extraordinary measures” in order to keep making payments on the debt, but there is a limit to what the Treasury can do. If the Congress does not increase the debt limit by August 2nd the Treasury will simply not have the funds to keep paying off the debt already borrowed, and for all intents and purposes that means a default.

Debt Ceiling Good: Economy

Failure to raise debt ceiling will kill financial markets globally

**Associated Press 6-26** (Ken Thomas. “Biden warns GOP on debt ceiling talks,” *Salon*, 6-26-11. < http://www.salon.com/news/feature/2011/06/26/us\_biden\_2012\_1> LV)

Republican leaders say without a deal cutting long-term deficits, they will not vote to increase the nation's borrowing -- which will exceed its $14.3 trillion limit on Aug. 2. The Obama administration has warned that if Congress fails to raise the debt ceiling, it would lead to the first U.S. financial default in history and roil financial markets around the globe.

Default leads to economic catastrophe

**Witt ’11** (Ryan. “How the debt ceiling issue will start affecting Americans very soon,” *Examiner*, 5-12-11. < http://www.examiner.com/political-buzz-in-national/how-the-debt-ceiling-issue-will-start-affecting-americans-very-soon> LV)

Finally, there is the risk that the debt ceiling fight could spark another recession. Just as the economy begins to recover and companies are start to hire again, it all could be brought to a halt if employers believe an economic catastrophe is on the horizon in the form of a government default. White House advisor Austan Goolsbee has said an “economic catastrophe” would emerge from a failure to raise the debt ceiling. Even Speaker Boehner conceded that a financial disaster would result from a default on the United States debt.

Failure to raise debt ceiling will slow the economy

AP ’11 ( “Q&A: What happens if Congress doesn’t approve a debt limit increase?” *Associated Press*, 5-16-11. < http://www2.tbo.com/news/politics/2011/may/16/q-amp-a-what-happens-if-congress-doesnt-approve-a--ar-207925/> LV)

Q: What would happen if Congress doesn't raise the debt ceiling by Aug. 2 or whenever Treasury exhausts all its short-options? A: Things would get ugly fast. "When bills became due, we could not pay all of them," says Maya MacGuineas, president of the Committee for a Responsible Budget, a bipartisan group that advocates cutting the debt. "If that happens, you shake up markets as you've never seen before. … It's inconceivable we would willingly walk ourselves over the cliff." The government needs to borrow $738 billion to get through the fiscal year that ends Sept. 30, according to the Congressional Research Service. Somehow, it would have to close that gap. It could: — Cut government spending dramatically. To put things in context, $738 billion is equal to 40 percent of the $1.7 trillion that the government is expected to spend in the last six months of the fiscal year. Everything from military salaries to Medicare and Social Security benefits to interest payments on the debt would be vulnerable. — Come up with $738 billion in new tax revenue, increasing by 66 percent the $1.1 trillion the government is expected to collect in taxes in the second half of the fiscal year. — Choose a combination of draconian spending cuts and tax increases. If investors become convinced the U.S. will renege on its debts, they'll sell Treasurys to avoid the risk that the government might not make good on them. That would drive Treasury prices down and push interest rates up, raising the borrowing costs on everything from mortgages to cars. Higher rates would likely slow the economy.

Debt Ceiling Good: Economy

Economic damage would be irreversible

**Witt ’11** (Ryan. “How the debt ceiling issue will start affecting Americans very soon,” *Examiner*, 5-12-11. < http://www.examiner.com/political-buzz-in-national/how-the-debt-ceiling-issue-will-start-affecting-americans-very-soon> LV)

Finally, as Nate Silver from The New York Times concludes, once a default occurs much of the damage will be irreversible. Much like an individual who stops making payments on their loans, the United States government will not be able to simply renew its old credit rating by making payments on the debt again. Once a default occurs the credit of the United States will be severely impacted in the long term, at the very least making it more expensive for the country to borrow in the future.

Debt Ceiling Good: Economy—Now Key

Now key

**MSNBC ’11** (John W. Schoen. “Debt ceiling brawl threatens economy, consumers,” *MSNBC*, 4-11-11. < http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/42536397/ns/business-eye\_on\_the\_economy/t/debt-ceiling-brawl-threatens-economy-consumers/> LV)

Anything that threatens to derail or delay the process of raising the debt ceiling is a red flag for markets. The longer it takes and the deeper the divide in Washington, the more markets will worry that the United States, the world's largest debtor nation, will default on its debt obligations with economy-rattling consequences.

Failing to raise debt ceiling by August 2 would collapse every market and cause a double-dip recession

**National Journal ’11** (“Six consequences of not raising the debt ceiling,” *Government Executive*, 5-27-11. < http://www.govexec.com/dailyfed/0511/052711-debt-ceiling.htm> LV)

If Congress fails to raise the debt limit by August 2, the Treasury has only two options: It can default on its debt - meaning, stop paying its creditors around the world - or continue to pay creditors but halt any other federal spending above what the government collects in taxes. In effect, that would mean an overnight spending cut of about 40 percent. Here are six consequences if the Treasury is forced to choose one of those options: 1. Cut $125 Billion Per Month - Right now, the federal government must borrow an additional $125 billion each month to finance all of its commitments. If the Treasury chooses to continue to pay creditors but stop all other federal spending, the government will have to begin reducing its spending by $125 billion every 30 days--immediately. These cuts could affect everything from NASA and the FBI to congressional salaries and White House operating expenses. 2. Treasury Bonds Collapse - If the government defaults on its debt, economists say that prices for Treasury bonds would collapse and interest rates would probably soar to record highs. The centrist Democratic think tank Third Way estimates that the bond rate increases alone would eliminate nearly 650,000 jobs in the United States. 3. Cut Medicare and Social Security - To reduce spending by $125 billion a month, the government would have to make deep cuts to the two giant entitlement programs for the elderly, Medicare and Social Security. 4. Stock Market Plunge - Wall Street generally agrees with Geithner that it would be a disaster if the U.S. defaulted on its debt. In addition to damaging the nation's creditworthiness in global markets, most experts agree it would torpedo the stock market and very possibly trigger a double-dip recession. 5. Government Furloughs or Mass Layoffs - The federal government would most likely turn to furloughs or mass layoffs to immediately cut spending, possibly including the salaries earned by the approximately 2,000 people who work at the Bureau of Public Debt, the department that borrows the money to keep the federal government running. This could drain even more money from local economies and the states' tax bases. 6. Sky-High Mortgage and Interest Rates - If the government defaults, interest rates on mortgages would shoot up and homebuyers and small businesses would have trouble getting loans even if they could afford the higher interest.

Economy Impacts

Economic decline leads to wars of all kind

Lopez ’98 (Bernardo V. Business World, 9-10-98.)  
Certainly, global recession will spawn wars of all kinds. Ethnic wars can easily escalate in the grapple for dwindling food stocks as in India-Pakistan-Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, Ethiopia-Eritrea, Indonesia. Regional conflicts in key flashpoints can easily erupt such as in the Middle East, Korea, and Taiwan. In the Philippines, as in some Latin American countries, splintered insurgency forces may take advantage of the economic drought to regroup and reemerge in the countryside. Unemployment worldwide will be in the billions. Famine can be triggered in key Third World nations with India, North Korea, Ethiopia and other African countries as first candidates. Food riots and the breakdown of law and order are possibilities. Unemployment in the US will be the hardest to cope with since it may have very little capability for subsistence economy and its agrarian base is automated and controlled by a few. The riots and looting of stores in New York City in the late '70s because of a state-wide brownout hint of the type of anarchy in the cities. Such looting in this most affluent nation is not impossible. The weapons industry may also grow rapidly because of the ensuing wars. Arms escalation will have Primacy over food production if wars escalate. The US will depend increasingly on weapons exports to nurse its economy back to health. This will further induce wars and conflicts which will aggravate US recession rather than solve it. The US may depend more and more on the use of force and its superiority to get its ways internationally.

Economic collapse causes nuclear conflict.

**Mead ‘92** (Walter Russell Mead, Senior Fellow for U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, World Policy Institute, 1992)  
Hundreds of millions – billions – of people have pinned their hopes on the international market economy. They and their leaders have embraced market principles – and drawn closer to the west – because they believe that our system can work for them. But what if it can’t? What if the global economy stagnates – or even shrinks? In that case, we will face a new period of international conflict: South against North, rich against poor. Russia, China, India – these countries with their billions of people and their nuclear weapons will pose a much greater danger to world order than Germany and Japan did in the 30s.

Economy Impacts

Economic collapse causes world war three.

**Mead ‘98** (Walter Russell: Senior Fellow, Council of Foreign Relations. *Houston Chronicle*, 8-30-98)

Forget suicide car bombers and Afghan fanatics. It’s the financial markets, not the terrorist training camps, that pose the biggest immediate threat to world peace. How can this be? This about the mother of all global meltdowns: the Great Depression that started in 1929. U.S. stocks began to collapse in October, staged a rally, then the market headed south big time. At the bottom, the Dow Jones Industrial Average had lost 90 percent of its value. Wages plummeted, thousands of banks and brokerages went bankrupt, millions of people lost their jobs. There were similar horror stories worldwide. But the biggest impact of the Depression on the United States – and on world history – wasn’t money. It was blood: World War II, to be exact. The Depression brought Adolf Hitler to power in Germany, undermined the ability of moderates to oppose Josef Stalin’s power in Russia, and convinced the Japanese military that the country had no choice but to build an Asian empire, even if that meant war with the United States and Britain. That’s the thing about depressions. They aren’t just bad for your 401(k). Let the world economy crash far enough, and the rules change. We stop playing The Price is Right and start up a new round of Saving Private Ryan.

Economic growth solves crime, famine, AIDS, war, and the environment.

**Silk** ‘**93** (Leonard: Professor of economics @ Pace University, *Foreign Affairs*, Winter 1993.)

Like the Great Depression, the current economic slump has fanned the fires of nationalist, ethnic and religious hatred around the world. Economic hardship is not the only cause of these social and political pathologies, but it aggravates all of them, and in turn they feed back on economic development. They also undermine efforts to deal with such global problems as environmental pollution, the production and trafficking of drugs, crime, sickness, famine, AIDS and other plagues.Growth will not solve all of these problems by itself. But economic growth – and growth alone – creates the additional resources that make it possible to achieve such fundamental goals as higher living standards, national and collective security, a healthier environment, and more liberal and open economies and societies.

Collapse of the economy will cause neo-colonial nuclear wars and genocide.

**Lewis ’98** (Chris H: Environmental Historian, U of Colorado-Boulder, *The Coming Age of Scarcity,* pg. 56)  
Most critics would argue, probably correctly, that instead of allowing underdeveloped countries to withdraw from the global economy and undermine the economies of the developed world, the Untied States, Europe, Japan, and others will fight neocolonial wars to force these countries to remain within the collapsing global economy**.** These neocolonial wars will result in mass death, suffering, and even regional nuclear wars**.** If First World countries choose military confrontation and political repression to maintain the global economy, then we may see mass death and genocide on a global scale that will make the deaths of WWII pale in comparison**.** However, these neocolonial wars, fought to maintain the developed nations’ economic and political hegemony, will cause the final collapse of our global industrial civilization. These wars will so damage the complex economic and trading networks and squander material, biological and energy resources that they will undermine the global economy that its ability to support the earth’s 6 to 8 billion people. This would be the worst case scenario for the collapse of global civilization.

2NC—Government Collapse Add-On

Failure to raise debt ceiling means government shuts down, military collapse, NASA shutdown (turns case) and economic collapse

**Brooks ’11** (Mo. “Raise the Debt Ceiling or Shot Down the Government and Crash the Economy,” *Hunstville Tea Party*, 5-2-11. < http://www.huntsvilleteaparty.com/cms/index.php/political-news/248-raise-the-debt-ceiling-or-shut-down-the-government-and-crash-the-economy> LV)

1. There is zero money for national defense. All of America's uniformed personnel are laid off. There is no army, air force, navy, marines or coast guard. All military civilian personnel are laid off. All defense contractors' employees are laid off. And what happens to American warfighters in Afghanistan, Iraq and other places around the world when the money runs out 2. There is zero money for Congress, the White House, federal courts and the justice department. All related personnel are laid off. The federal government's governing entities cease to function.3. There is zero money for executive branch agencies. There is no CIA or FBI. Corrections officers at federal prisons are laid off and dangerous criminals are set free. There is no IRS (which means taxes go uncollected, leaving the federal government with no means to pay entitlements or interest on the debt). There is no NASA, HUD, or any other federal government agency. All federal employees are laid off.

Debt Ceiling Good: Gov’t Collapse

Failure to raise debt ceiling will lead to governmental collapse

**Brooks ’11** (Mo. “Raise the Debt Ceiling or Shot Down the Government and Crash the Economy,” *Hunstville Tea Party*, 5-2-11. < http://www.huntsvilleteaparty.com/cms/index.php/political-news/248-raise-the-debt-ceiling-or-shut-down-the-government-and-crash-the-economy> LV)

Hence, if the debt ceiling is not raised, if available revenues are applied to entitlements and interest on the debt, if America immediately limits expenditures to revenues, and if taxes are not significantly increased, there is a substantial risk and probability of a federal government collapse. While some conservatives may say "Go ahead!", there are probable and horrific real-life consequences to a federal government collapse caused by a lack of funds. After payment of entitlements and interest on the debt:

Gov’t Collapse Bad: Anarchy

Anarchy from debt ceiling leads to transitional violence

**Brooks ’11** (Mo. “Raise the Debt Ceiling or Shot Down the Government and Crash the Economy,” *Hunstville Tea Party*, 5-2-11. < http://www.huntsvilleteaparty.com/cms/index.php/political-news/248-raise-the-debt-ceiling-or-shut-down-the-government-and-crash-the-economy> LV)

If the federal government and American economy collapse, anarchy is a real risk. Riots and killings are a real risk. Although it sounds nice to say "don't raise the debt ceiling", I know of no one who has thought through the cascading effects of that action who believes that course of action is either prudent or advisable.

Gov’t Collapse Bad: Turns Case

Turns case – NASA would functionally shut down

**Space Politics ’11** (“How would a government shutdown affect NASA?” *Space Politics*, 2-26-11 < http://www.spacepolitics.com/2011/02/26/how-would-a-government-shutdown-affect-nasa/> LV)

The current continuing resolution that funds the federal government, including NASA, expires in less than a week: midnight on Friday, March 4. Unless Congress can agree to a new funding bill, be it a full FY11 appropriations act, as the House passed last week with HR 1, or another short-term stopgap bill, the federal government will be shut down—just as NASA is wrapping up the STS-133 shuttle mission to the ISS.

For the mission itself, a shutdown would have little or no impact. “For the mission that’s flying we’d probably consider most of the folks mission critical personnel, and that’s pretty much transparent to us,” said Bill Gerstenmaier, NASA associate administrator for space operations, in the STS-133 post-launch press conference late Thursday (skip ahead to the 17:50 mark to catch the question from Craig Covault and Gerstermaier’s response.) “I think from a top-level standpoint we’ll be able to just press on and continue kind of the way we’re heading.” How it might affect preparations for the final two shuttle missions is less clear. “We’ll kind of see what happens. We haven’t really done any detailed contingency planning yet,” Gerstermaier said of the agency’s overall planning. While a shutdown might not affect the current shuttle mission or ISS operations, much of the rest of the agency might be severely affected. The AP report that during the last government shutdown, in the mid-1990s, only seven percent of NASA employees were at work. It’s not clear whether that percentage would be higher, or even lower, if there’s a government shutdown down in a week, but it’s likely a lot of activities would not be deemed “mission critical” and thus put on hold until a new appropriations bill is passed.
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KORUS passes now—but political capital is key

“[Viwepoint] Endgame for Korus,” Korea JoongAng Daily, 7/6/2011, <http://joongangdaily.joins.com/article/view.asp?aid=2938477>

Four years after striking an initial deal with Korea, and after a number of significant revisions to that deal, President Barack Obama has finally announced a plan for Congressional consideration of the Korea-U.S. FTA (Korus), and he hopes for ratification prior to the Congressional recess in August. Under his plan, the Senate, controlled by Obama’s Democratic Party, will soon begin consideration of the legislation, with subsequent review by the Republican-controlled House. Prospects for the passage of Korus have never been so good, and there are grounds for optimism.  Obama’s plan for Korus’ ratification, however, is a high-stakes political gamble in an enormously complicated political environment. After trying for months to forge a bipartisan consensus on the ratification, Obama has changed course and opted to try to push Korus through Congress in tandem with other controversial trade legislation. To succeed in this gamble, Obama must overcome a number of immediate challenges under great time pressure. 

<insert specific link>

SKFTA solves Korean war

WSJ, 10 “South Korea's Prosperity Defense; Seoul finds strength in growth—and Washington can help,” 11/26/10, lexis

North Korea's unprovoked attack Tuesday on South Korean civilians is causing justifiable consternation among leaders in Seoul, Tokyo, Washington and (perhaps) Beijing. One group of people, however, has seemed less concerned: investors. The Korean stock exchange has bounced back quickly, and the value of the Korean won is returning to its pre-crisis level after a fall on the day. Among the many reasons for this market stability, it is important to credit South Korean President Lee Myung-bak. It's true that investors have remained calm in part because they've come to expect periodic belligerence from the North and have already priced that risk into the market. This is reflected in the so-called Korea discount, which historically has seen Korean stocks trade at lower levels than shares in similar economies such as Taiwan according to metrics like price-to-book ratios. Yet that discount has narrowed over the past year, even as the North has become more obstreperous. And although the government announced it was standing ready to intervene to stabilize markets, it appears not to have done so. One reason there was little need for intervention is better economic policy from Seoul. Mr. Lee has begun several important structural reforms since his term started in 2008, all of which make Korea a more attractive destination for capital. The most important change is the government's strong pro-trade stance, including pressing hard for ratification of the free trade agreement his predecessor signed with the United States and negotiating a similar deal with the European Union. He also used his platform as host of the recent G-20 summit to press for progress on multilateral trade liberalization. By opening Korea's highly protected domestic market, the EU deal will, and U.S. pact would, force Korean companies to become more competitive and productive. This will spur new entrepreneurship, a boon for Koreans and investors alike. The Lee government has also made progress on tax reform. Although the president had to compromise on the timetable for rolling out a cut in the top corporate tax rate to 20% from 22%, the fact that he pushed for the rate cut is a signal that Seoul wants to encourage business instead of punishing it. He also secured a compromise allowing enforcement of long-ignored provisions in the law governing unionization that could loosen the grip of organized labor on many large companies and lead to a freer labor market. South Koreans are the biggest beneficiaries of this reform mindset. The country weathered the global financial crisis fairly well and is expected to achieve 6% growth this year. Liberalization also has national security implications. By creating an environment that can attract and retain investment despite Pyongyang's truculence, the South immunizes itself against Kim Jong Il's attempts at blackmail. If the stock market had not bounced back so quickly, the signal would have been that this kind of attack can dent the South's economy. Beyond reducing Kim's ability to scare investors, a strong economy in the South is the surest way to prepare for costs of reunification following regime collapse in the North—a contingency that seems less and less remote as Kim struggles to execute a hereditary succession to a relatively young and unknown son amid serious economic problems in the North. The outside world has a role to play, too, especially Washington. Free trade is a centerpiece of Mr. Lee's economic strategy and he has invested significant political capital in pushing for ratification of the Korea-U.S. free-trade agreement, which still faces stiff opposition in the U.S. Congress. This week has shown how important a strong Korean economy can be in standing up to Kim's provocations. President Obama and Congress can ill afford to pass up any opportunity to bolster Seoul's defenses, and that includes reinforcing the economic ramparts.

1NC—SKFTA Good DA (2/2)

The impact is global nuclear conflict

Hayes and Green, 10 - \*Victoria University AND \*\*Executive Director of the Nautilus Institute (Peter and Michael, “-“The Path Not Taken, the Way Still Open: Denuclearizing the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia”, 1/5, http://www.nautilus.org/fora/security/10001HayesHamalGreen.pdf)

The consequences of failing to address the proliferation threat posed by the North Korea developments, and related political and economic issues, are serious, not only for the Northeast Asian region but for the whole international community. At worst, there is the possibility of nuclear attack1, whether by intention, miscalculation, or merely accident, leading to the resumption of Korean War hostilities. On the Korean Peninsula itself, key population centres are well within short or medium range missiles. The whole of Japan is likely to come within North Korean missile range. Pyongyang has a population of over 2 million, Seoul (close to the North Korean border) 11 million, and Tokyo over 20 million. Even a limited nuclear exchange would result in a holocaust of unprecedented proportions. But the catastrophe within the region would not be the only outcome. New research indicates that even a limited nuclear war in the region would rearrange our global climate far more quickly than global warming. Westberg draws attention to new studies modelling the effects of even a limited nuclear exchange involving approximately 100 Hiroshima-sized 15 kt bombs2 (by comparison it should be noted that the United States currently deploys warheads in the range 100 to 477 kt, that is, individual warheads equivalent in yield to a range of 6 to 32 Hiroshimas).The studies indicate that the soot from the fires produced would lead to a decrease in global temperature by 1.25 degrees Celsius for a period of 6-8 years.3 In Westberg’s view: That is not global winter, but the nuclear darkness will cause a deeper drop in temperature than at any time during the last 1000 years. The temperature over the continents would decrease substantially more than the global average. A decrease in rainfall over the continents would also follow...The period of nuclear darkness will cause much greater decrease in grain production than 5% and it will continue for many years...hundreds of millions of people will die from hunger...To make matters even worse, such amounts of smoke injected into the stratosphere would cause a huge reduction in the Earth’s protective ozone.4 These, of course, are not the only consequences. Reactors might also be targeted, causing further mayhem and downwind radiation effects, superimposed on a smoking, radiating ruin left by nuclear next-use. Millions of refugees would flee the affected regions. The direct impacts, and the follow-on impacts on the global economy via ecological and food insecurity, could make the present global financial crisis pale by comparison. How the great powers, especially the nuclear weapons states respond to such a crisis, and in particular, whether nuclear weapons are used in response to nuclear first-use, could make or break the global non proliferation and disarmament regimes. There could be many unanticipated impacts on regional and global security relationships5, with subsequent nuclear breakout and geopolitical turbulence, including possible loss-of-control over fissile material or warheads in the chaos of nuclear war, and aftermath chain-reaction affects involving other potential proliferant states. The Korean nuclear proliferation issue is not just a regional threat but a global one that warrants priority consideration from the international community.

UQ—Will Pass—Business Lobbies

Powerful business lobbies support passage

Bloomberg 6-28 (Mark Drajem and Eric Martin, “Obama Lures Trade-Deal Support From Business,” Bloomberg, 6/28/2011, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-06-29/obama-lures-trade-deal-support-from-business-as-republicans-balk.html>

President Barack Obama won support of the largest U.S. business lobbying groups while Republicans balked at his plans to attach aid for displaced workers to stalled trade deals with South Korea, Panama and Colombia. The endorsement from groups including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which represents companies such as Pfizer Inc. (PFE) and PepsiCo Inc., came with a call for Republicans to drop their objections. It was a turnaround for business leaders, who in the past joined Republicans in criticizing Obama’s policies. “For members of Congress who care about American jobs, this is a moment of truth,” Thomas Donohue, the Chamber’s president, said in a statement. “I urge members of both parties to seize a reasonable compromise and move the trade agenda forward.” Consideration of the trade agreements, which have languished since 2007, got a boost yesterday when the Senate Finance Committee set plans for a hearing tomorrow on the accords. Draft legislation submitted by Democratic Senator Max Baucus of Montana, the committee chairman, with support from the Obama administration would attach Trade Adjustment Assistance for workers to the South Korea deal. Republicans protested connecting the two issues.

UQ—Will Pass—Top of the Docket

SKFTA is currently a top legislative priority—recent progress gives it momentum

Glade 6-20 (Jim Glade, “White House to send Colombia FTA to Congress before August recess: Kirk,” Colombia Reports, 6/20/2011, <http://colombiareports.com/colombia-news/news/17077-obama-administration-to-send-fta-to-congress-before-august-recess-state-dept-official.html>)

The Obama administration hopes to send trade agreements with Colombia, Panama and South Korea to Congress before the August recess, said a U.S. State Department advisor Sunday. “Now it seems like the stars are in alignment -- it’s that important to us,’’ economic advisor Kevin Sullivan told the Miami Herald. The initial plan was to send only the South Korean trade agreement for congressional approval before the recess, but because discussions between the Obama administration and Republican legislatures about domestic job assistance programs have been "narrowed substantially," informal debates in Congress are able to begin, said U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk on Monday. "We're making good progress. Hopefully we can resolve the few outstanding differences," said Kirk, a champion of the agreement with Colombia. U.S. legislators are busy trying to reach an agreement on the Trade-Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program that aims to provide aid and retraining to workers who lose their jobs as a result of increased imports before congressional debate on the FTA's with Colombia, South Korea and Panama begin. The chair of the House Ways and Means Committee, Rep. Kevin Brady (R, TX), said last week that a panel would start informal debates on the deals this week. Brady was reportedly hopeful that an agreement on the TAA program would be reached before the committee began debating the FTA's.

UQ—AT: Won’t Pass (South Korea)

South Korea supports the deal—at worst the GNP will push it through alone

Reuters 6-24 (Jack Kim, “Q+A-Where is the S.Korea, US free trade pact headed?” Reuters, 6/24/2011, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/06/24/korea-usa-trade-idUSL3E7HO0AC20110624>)

South Korea President Lee Myung-bak's government has sent the trade bill to parliament but the assembly has yet to set the date to begin reviewing it. A majority of the ruling Grand National Party (GNP) support the deal. Some opposition Democratic Party members oppose it, saying a revision to the deal reached in December damaged the interest of South Korean automakers. The ruling GNP has the number to force it through parliament but does not want to repeat the political embarrassment caused by a previous attempt to do so. IS THERE ENOUGH SUPPORT ONCE IT COMES TO A VOTE? The December revision addressed concerns by U.S. car makers and auto unions that the original deal had favoured South Korean automakers too heavily. U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk said those changes meant winning approval in Congress would no longer be "horribly difficult". But it still faces stiff opposition, including from the AFL-CIO, the main U.S. labour group. In South Korea, the pact has broad support from the public and from businesses which see it as a chance to enter a greater U.S. market and to buy cheaper imports at home. In addition to backing from the ruling GNP, some opposition Democratic Party members, who had supported the pact when the former liberal president negotiated it in 2007, are for the deal.

UQ—AT: Won’t Pass (TAA)

Current compromise will inevitably solve stalemate

Washington Times 7-7 (Tim Devaney, “Partisan rift stalling free-trade pacts,” Washington Times, 7/7/2011, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jul/7/partisan-rift-stalling-free-trade-pacts/>)

The White House recently announced a compromise with Mr. Baucus and House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp, Michigan Republican, on a scaled-down version of TAA, reducing the payments to displaced workers from 156 weeks to 117 weeks. The compromise would also cut the health coverage tax credit for affected workers and eliminate it altogether by the end of 2013. The free-trade deals have strong backing from the business community, and President Obama and top Hill Republicans have cited trade as one area of bipartisan cooperation in the wake of the 2010 midterm elections. The trade agreements originally were negotiated by the administration of President George W. Bush, but have yet to be officially submitted to Congress.

Push for TAA is just posturing—won’t hold back passage

McPherson Sentinel 5-17 (“Huelskamp says House GOP determined to pass FTAs,” 5/17/2011, http://www.mcphersonsentinel.com/agriculture/x1357376295/Huelskamp-says-House-GOP-determined-to-pass-FTAs)

The White House and congressional Republicans have reached an impasse on the ratification of three federal trade agreements after the White House announced Monday that it would not sign the trade agreements until Congress renews the expired Trade Adjustment Assistance program. The program aims to provide job retraining for workers displaced by foreign competition. The move comes as administration officials begin talks on Capitol Hill to finalize the agreements reached with the White House to expand trade with South Korea, Panama and Colombia. President Barack Obama has said the deals are an integral part of his economic agenda and the pacts have broad Republican support. Rep. Tim Huelskamp, who testified for the agreements as a member of the House Agriculture Committee, called Monday’s announcement political posturing by the administration to pacify the labor unions. The retraining assistance program was expanded two years ago as part of Obama's stimulus package to include aid for more displaced workers, but the expansion expired in February. Labor unions and some key Democratic lawmakers have demanded the expansion as a condition for supporting the trade deals. Renewal of the job retraining program was not mentioned during the House Agriculture’s hearings on the FTAs Huelskamp said.

IL—Political Capital Key

Political capital is key to passage

Wharton ‘11 (Knowledge@Wharton, publication of the business school of the University of Pennsylvania, "U.S.-South Korea Trade Pact: A Turning Point for American Exports?," 1/12/2011, http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article.cfm?articleid=2671)

With Portman now in the Senate and other pro-trade Republicans in key positions -- such as new Speaker John Boehner of Ohio and Majority Whip Eric Cantor of Virginia -- it is tempting to believe that both the House and the Senate will quickly push through the Korea agreement and then move on to Colombia, Panama and other trade pacts. But everything hinges on the ability of the President to assert his leadership on the Korea deal. "The President has demonstrated leadership," says Dittrich, "and we have no reason to think that he won't continue to do so." The battle over the Korea agreement seems likely to pit Obama on one side -- along with pro-trade Republicans. On the other side will be anti-trade Democrats and Tea Party Republicans.

Many leaders of the business community fear that the Tea Party will undermine their efforts to promote pro-trade initiatives by shooting down this deal and others. "You can't assume, as in the past, that a Republican Congress is entirely pro-trade," says USCIB's Mulligan. "The Republicans have developed this populist tinge, and they are focusing on the China trade" as a key target.

Political capital is key to hold parties together—delaying too long risks failure

EIU ‘10 Economist Intelligence Unit – ViewsWire, 12/22/10, “Panama economy: Will US trade deal advance?” lexis

Panamanian officials claim that the TIEA will create a favourable environment for the ratification of the US-Panama TPA, which the US has delayed since it was signed in 2007. Although the services-based nature of Panama's economy implies that the trade accord would be of less direct benefit to Panama than it would be to other countries in the region which are more dependent on goods trade, an agreement nonetheless would make the investment climate more attractive for many foreign businesses. US President Barack Obama, for his part, has signalled that trade—including resuscitation of the stalled Doha round of global trade talks—and the expansion of US exports will be top priorities in the next two years of his administration. However, he has not yet submitted any of the pending trade agreements (Panama, Colombia and South Korea) to Congress for approval. And there is a significant risk that more pressing domestic and external issues, combined with the Mr Obama’s weaker legislative mandate after the Democrats’ losses in mid-term elections, could prevent ratification of the accords during the remainder of Mr Obama's term, which expires in January 2013. Reshaped Congress At first glance, it seems that trade deals would stand a better chance of ratification following the Republican Party’s victory in securing control of the lower house of Congress. Republican lawmakers have tended to be more free-trade oriented than many of their Democratic counterparts. The South Korea, Colombia and Panama deals were all negotiated by a Republican administration. A number of Democrats oppose the pacts, in part on the grounds that labour and human rights are not sufficiently protected (in the case of Colombia), and in part because they believe that such agreements result in the export of US jobs. In Panama’s case, the lack of a bilateral tax treaty was the main obstacle. The Democrats’ dominance in the outgoing Congress limited the prospect of ratification for these accords. Yet even with a Republican House of Representatives and a larger Republican bench in the Senate, passage of free-trade deals is not assured. The South Korea accord, which got top priority in the Obama White House, was revised in recent talks with the South Korean government that concluded in early December. It might therefore stand the best chance of being submitted to Congress first. If ratified, it will be the biggest trade deal for the US since the North American Free-Trade Agreement (NAFTA) came into force in 1994. President needs to push hard It is unclear how much political capital Mr Obama is willing, or able, to expend on the other two agreements, with Panama and Colombia, where the stakes are lower. While in theory he should be able to forge agreement with the Republican leadership, both sides will still have to convince elements within their camps. On the Democratic side, opponents to free-trade pacts include the AFL-CIO and other organised labour groups and the more liberal members of the party, including outgoing Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi. On the Republican side, several leaders have strong pro-trade credentials, including the next Speaker of the House John Boehner and current party whip Eric Cantor. Pro-traders are in line for leadership roles on the key House Ways and Means Committee. A boost in the Senate will come from the election of Rob Portman, who served as US Trade Representative under President Bush and who describes himself as the “quarterback” of the successful drive to ratify another accord, the Central American Free-Trade Agreement (CAFTA), in 2005. However, the Republican leaders might face recalcitrant freshman Tea Party congressmen and other rank-and-file members who won’t want to co-operate with Mr Obama at all. Moreover, US public opinion has shifted against trade accords in an environment of high unemployment or more protectionist sentiment There will still be opportunities to secure the needed backing for Panama and Colombia accords under the new Congress that is seated in January, but only if the White House pushes hard and early, and convinces lawmakers that this will boost economic growth and job creation. Without Mr Obama’s strong political commitment, however, the risk that the deals will continue to languish will grow as the 2012 presidential election draws closer.

2NC—Chinese Expansion Add-On (1/2)

SKFTA is key to regional US influence and checks Chinese expansionism

Bandow 10 Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute (Doug, The Daily Caller, “South Korea Free Trade Agreement Key to Prosperity and Security,” 10/19/2010, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=12488,

The Korean FTA also is part of East Asia's greater economic game. A rising China is bumping up against a still dominant America. Strengthening trade ties is one way for Washington to ensure continued American influence in East Asia. Especially since East Asian countries have increasingly turned, with or without the U.S., to bilateral economic agreements to promote trade. Despite the Wall Street crash, the U.S. retains the world's largest and most productive economy. However, the PRC now possesses the second largest economy. Moreover, China's rapid economic growth has naturally led to expanded Chinese investment and trade throughout East Asia. China's top trading partner is the U.S., but the former's second through fifth largest are Japan, Hong Kong, South Korea, and Taiwan. Australia, Malaysia, and Singapore fall in at numbers seven, nine, and ten. Between 2007 and 2008, all of these countries except Singapore saw its trade with the People's Republic of China increase faster than its trade with America. China's increasing economic growth is leading to increasing Chinese domination of East Asian economies. American companies have been pushed into second and even third place, most notably in South Korea and Japan. As recently as 2003, the U.S. was number one in the former. At the same time, the PRC is asserting itself politically throughout Asia, including in the ROK. China has linked its growing economic power with strong diplomatic initiatives throughout Asia. In June Beijing finalized the economic framework cooperation agreement with Taiwan, and is pressing for FTAs with Australia and Japan. Most important, the PRC and South Korea have discussed the possibility of a FTA. There are significant barriers to agreements between Beijing and all of these nations. But the fact the PRC is pursuing this strategy — and that America's three leading military allies in the region view FTAs with China as a serious possibility — illustrate the challenge now facing Washington. Nor is South Korea waiting for the U.S. Last year Seoul completed the world's largest bilateral trade pact, with the European Union. Despite political opposition in Europe, similar to that in the U.S., the agreement will soon take effect. American manufacturers will then find themselves at a disadvantage compared to European producers — one estimate is a likely loss of roughly $30 billion in exports. Frank Vargo, vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers, argued: "if the president sends the [U.S.-ROK] agreement up in early 2011, we will be able to avoid the export and job loss" that otherwise will result from the European pact. If not, however, Prof. Choi Byung-il warns that the European agreement "poses a serious and substantial threat to the commercial interests of the United States, including automobiles, legal services, and accounting services." Yet the U.S.-ROK FTA sits unratified in Washington. Expanding trade ties offers geopolitical advantages as well. The Bush administration may have overstated the benefits, but only slightly, when it argued: "By boosting economic ties and broadening and modernizing our longstanding alliance, it promises to become the pillar of our alliance for the next 50 years, as the Mutual Defense Treaty has been for the last 50 years." Washington's influence in East Asia is slowly ebbing. And America's military alliance, created in a different era, is obsolescent. The two nations, once united by the threat of a dangerous North Korea backed by a hostile China and Soviet Union, now perceive regional threats differently. The U.S. already has begun a force drawdown and a full withdrawal is becoming ever more likely. To meet this challenge Washington needs to employ American "soft power" — access to the world's most important, advanced, and productive economy. Chinese influence will inevitably grow throughout East Asia. But the U.S. need not yield the playing field; instead, it should actively engage friendly nations. The most profitable and least dangerous means to do so is to make it easier for its people to trade. Washington should press for multilateral agreements, particularly the long-stalled Doha round of the World Trade Organization. Various nations also have expressed interest in a Trans-Pacific Strategic Economic Partnership, a Free Trade Area in the Asia Pacific, an East Asian Community, and other similar though differently-named groupings. The U.S. government should respond positively to any and all. Washington also should negotiate FTAs with Japan and Taiwan. So too with ASEAN, the collection of highly-trade dependent Southeast Asian states which currently host nearly $300 billion worth of U.S. investment. But the start is for Congress to ratify the trade accord with South Korea. Failing to approve the South Korean FTA would likely result in permanent economic and geopolitical damage. This would be a high price to pay at any time, but especially when China is rapidly expanding its influence throughout East Asia.

2NC—Chinese Expansion Add-On (2/2)

And, this military presence deters Chinese aggression towards Taiwan --- withdrawal upsets the precarious balances ensures Sino- Taiwan warfare

Alagappa**,** Senior Fellow East-West Center PhD, International Affairs, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy Tufts University03 [Muthia, “Asian security order: instrumental and normative features”, p. google books]

The United States has also intervened in the increasingly tense standoff between China and Taiwan. The U.S. goal has been **to deter China from seeking a** military solution (the Taiwan Relations Act of 1974 calls for the United States to come to Taiwan's aid if it is attacked) and, in addition, to dissuade Taiwan from provocative acts of independence. In March 1996, China fired missiles close to Taiwan in anticipation of Taiwanese elections. This action was meant to intimidate Taiwan and had the temporary effect of stalling shipping in the Taiwan Straits. The United States responded by dispatching two aircraft carriers and some fourteen other warships to the area. Through its strategy of "calculated ambiguity" Washington meant to deter possible Chinese aggression and simultaneously to signal its willingness to maintain a cooperative relationship with China. Washington prepared to take similar steps early in 2000 as China once again escalated its rhetoric (this time without launching missiles) in anticipation of an- other Taiwanese election (Kaiser and Mufson 2000a), rourlh, U.S. hegemony has contributed to regional order by helping to stave off in Asia the kind of nationalist economic competition (and attendant political friction) that plagued the world economy during the 1930s. The potential for beg- gar-thy-neighbor policies certainly emerged during the late 1990s. The Asian financial crisis was a profound shock that might well have led to closed markets, competitive devaluations, and a downward spiral of trade and growth. The management of this crisis was found in Washington rather than Tokyo or elsewhere in the region. During the crisis, the U.S. Federal Reserve lowered interest rates to assure global liquidity and maintain high growth in the United States. As the cri- sis eased, the United Stales spurred recovery by taking in the huge flood of ex- ports from emerging economies as well as from China and Japan.1' Washington's response to the crisis reflected its regional economic strategy of seeking to liber- alize the developmental capitalist markets of Japan and Southeast Asia while at the same time integrating China into the liberal world economy. It is important to recognize the limits of hegemony as a means to promote regional order. In essence, the U.S. hegemonic project in the Asia Pacific is more a holding action than a progressive strategy for resolving security problems. **It is an effort to stabilize** a status quo that reflects U.S. dominance. Although Washington has worked hard to keep relations among major powers in the region from deteriorating, it docs not seem to have a plan for resolving the long-standing ten sions in these relationships. In fact, since the United States does not want to en- courage a balancing coalition against its dominant position, it is not clear that it has a strategic interest in the full resolution of differences between, say, Japan and China or Russia and China. Some tension among these states reinforces their need for a special relationship with the United States. Similarly, **Washington has defused regional crises in Asia** without any funda- mental resolution of the underlying disputes. The series of U.S.-initiated economic concessions to North Korea, for example, reflects more an effort to buy time than a plan to transform the politics of the Korean peninsula. Korean unification, in fact, would be a mixed blessing for the United States in light of its hegemonic strategy. Unification, after all, would diminish the need for a U.S. military presence in Korea—a presence U.S. officials believe is important not only to defend South Korea but also to stabilize relations elsewhere in East Asia. Not surprisingly, Washington sought to keep the issue of U.S. forward-deployed forces off the table as the two Koreas began their detente process in 2000 (Harrison 2001). Washington's diplomacy toward the China-Taiwan dispute proceeds in a similar spirit. Decisive steps by Taiwan toward independence would provoke China and raise the potential for **military conflict.** An aggressive attempt by China to incorporate Taiwan would force the United Stales either to defend Tai- wan or to appease China—both of which are costly options. For the United Slates, an uneasy stalemate is preferable in current circumstances to any dramatic attempt at resolution. **Washington has managed the conflict** by trying to protect Taiwan **without emboldening it and trying to deter China** without isolating or provoking it.

Global nuclear war

Hunkovic**,** American Military University,09 [Lee J, 2009, “The Chinese-Taiwanese Conflict Possible Futures of a Confrontation between China, Taiwan and the United States of America”, <http://www.lamp-method.org/eCommons/Hunkovic.pdf>]

A war between China, Taiwan and the United States has the potential **to escalate into a nuclear conflict and a third world war**, therefore, many countries other than the primary actors could be affected by such a conflict, including Japan, both Koreas, Russia, Australia, India and Great Britain, if they were drawn into the war, as well as all other countries in the world that participate in the global economy, in which the United States and China are the two most dominant members. If China were able to successfully annex Taiwan, the possibility exists that they could then plan to attack Japan and begin a policy of aggressive expansionism in East and Southeast Asia, as well as the Pacific and even into India, which could in turn create an international standoff and deployment of military forces to contain the threat. In any case, if China and the United States engage in a full-scale conflict, there are few countries in the world that will not be economically and/or militarily affected by it. However, China, Taiwan and United States are the primary actors in this scenario, whose actions will determine its eventual outcome, therefore, other countries will not be considered in this study.

2NC—Economy Add-On (1/2)

SKFTA’s key to both economies

Bandow 10 Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute (Doug, The Daily Caller, “South Korea Free Trade Agreement Key to Prosperity and Security,” 10/19/2010, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=12488,

Washington should be expanding American investment and trade opportunities throughout East Asia. The starting point should be ratifying the FTA with the Republic of Korea (ROK). South Korea possesses one of the world's largest economies — number 13 at last count — and is among the top dozen trading nations. Total bilateral trade between the U.S. and the ROK ran about $85 billion in 2008. The seventh largest merchandise trading partner of the U.S., the ROK is a major importer of aircraft, cereals, chemicals, machinery, and plastics. Even a small expansion of U.S.-ROK trade would offer a significant benefit for America's economy. Despite its stunning economic success due in large part to exports, the South has never welcomed international competition. Korean business professor Moon Hwy-chang admits: "Korea has not been a very open economy." The FTA helps change that. Jeffrey Schott of the Peterson Institute for International Economics reported: "The U.S.-Korea pact covers more trade than any other U.S. trade agreement except the North American Free Trade Agreement" and "opens up substantial new opportunities for bilateral trade and investment in goods and services." Roughly 95 percent of trade would become duty free within three years and most of the other tariffs would be lifted within a decade. The accord would provide particularly significant benefits for U.S. agriculture, financial services companies, and American firms seeking access to ROK government procurement. Obviously, the FTA does not eliminate all economic barriers in the South — just as it does not eliminate all import restrictions by America. Nevertheless, even in the contested areas of autos and beef the FTA makes progress, eliminating taxes on the former and reducing tariffs on the latter. Only by ratifying the current agreement is further progress likely. Both countries would benefit economically from the FTA, but the U.S., whose share of Korean imports has been falling, would probably benefit more. According to the U.S. International Trade Commission, eliminating South Korean tariffs alone should add $10 billion to $12 billion to America's GDP. Demand for American audiovisual, financial, and telecommunications services also likely would increase substantially. Overall, the ITC figures that American exports to South Korea would go up nearly twice as much as imports from the ROK. Moreover, the longer-term gain could be even greater. First, South Koreans remain less affluent than suggested by their GDP: the ROK's per capita GDP is about $17,000. Continued strong growth — especially if enhanced by the sort of economic reforms which would be likely in the faced of increased U.S. economic competition — would enhance individual buying power, leading to increased purchases of American goods and services in the future. Second, reunification with the North is likely to come some day. A united Korea will be an even more important economic market for U.S. concerns. The FTA would give American companies an advantage when that day comes.

2NC—Economy Add-On (2/2)

Collapse causes nuclear war

Harris & Burrows 2009 Mathew, PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor of the U.S. National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer, member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f\_0016178\_13952.pdf

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states i n the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime . Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

SKFTA Good: Economy

SKFTA is critical to jobs and growth

Daily Titan ‘11 (Thomas J. Donohue, 1/6/11, " Korean Trade Pact is a Welcome Shot in the Arm for US Economy ", <http://www.dailytitan.com/2011/01/06/korean-trade-pact-is-a-welcome-shot-in-the-arm-for-u-s-economy/>)

KORUS will boost GDP by at least $12 billion through expanded exports and create more than 70,000 American jobs. Successful implementation of KORUS will not only create jobs but will save jobs. A Chamber of Commerce study found that failure to enact KORUS would cost more than 340,000 American jobs and cut $35 billion in exports. Those jobs would be lost because the European Union and others would gain a competitive advantage over America in Korea as their free trade agreements (FTAs) go into effect soon. KORUS will help the United States gain an important strategic foothold in Asia, one of the fastest-growing regions worldwide. Currently, the United States is at risk of being shut out of this market as the number of FTAs in Asia has exploded. There are more than 175 agreements in force, 20 awaiting implementation, and 50 under negotiation. By contrast, the United States has entered into exactly two FTAs with Pacific countries, Singapore and Australia. While we're trying to create jobs by exporting more American goods and services, our share of Asia's international trade is actually declining. Many U.S. manufacturers and farmers are being displaced by local competitors based in the European Union or Australia, which are forging deals across the region.

SKFTA boosts American economic growth and competitiveness

Donohue, ‘11 – president and CEO of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (1/6/11, Thomas J., “Korean trade pact is a welcome shot in the arm for U.S. economy,” <http://www.bellinghamherald.com/2011/01/06/1802767/korean-trade-pact-is-a-welcome.html>)

WASHINGTON -- A funny thing happened in the wake of the midterm elections: Washington entered into an era of bipartisanship, and trade is the unlikely topic of agreement. rom the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the United Auto Workers, President Obama's announcement that he'll send the Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (KORUS) to Congress early this year has been applauded. Trade leaders from both parties have pledged support, and the new Congress should act swiftly to ratify this pact. We must seize this opportunity. Now is the time to advance an aggressive trade and global engagement agenda that will create jobs, revitalize the economy, and reassert America's leadership. Such an agenda offers an excellent opportunity to advance the goal of doubling U.S. exports in five years and putting Americans back to work. It starts with ensuring congressional passage of KORUS by next summer. Working together, the Chamber of Commerce and the administration have vowed to build public support for this vital agreement that will help American companies sell their goods and services to the world's 12th-largest economy. KORUS will boost GDP by at least $12 billion through expanded exports and create more than 70,000 American jobs. Successful implementation of KORUS will not only create jobs but will save jobs. A Chamber of Commerce study found that failure to enact KORUS would cost more than 340,000 American jobs and cut $35 billion in exports. Those jobs would be lost because the European Union and others would gain a competitive advantage over America in Korea as their free trade agreements (FTAs) go into effect soon. KORUS will help the United States gain an important strategic foothold in Asia, one of the fastest-growing regions worldwide. Currently, the United States is at risk of being shut out of this market as the number of FTAs in Asia has exploded. There are more than 175 agreements in force, 20 awaiting implementation, and 50 under negotiation. By contrast, the United States has entered into exactly two FTAs with Pacific countries - Singapore and Australia. While we're trying to create jobs by exporting more American goods and services, our share of Asia's international trade is actually declining. Many U.S. manufacturers and farmers are being displaced by local competitors based in the European Union or Australia, which are forging deals across the region. That's why we're pleased the Obama administration has expressed strong support for swift completion of a Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement, which would ensure that America has access to this rapidly growing market and a level playing field on which to compete. Congressional Republican leaders have promised to approve not just KORUS but two other pending FTAs - with Colombia and Panama. While more than 90 percent of imports from these countries enter America duty free, most U.S.-manufactured goods face import taxes in the double digits when they enter Colombia and Panama. Our farm products face even steeper barriers. These agreements will end this unfair status quo for American workers, farmers and companies. We urge Congress to approve all three pending FTAs swiftly. Finally, we must revitalize the moribund Doha Round of global trade negotiations. A worldwide reduction in tariffs and trade barriers would provide a worldwide "stimulus," creating jobs, opportunities and higher standards of living around the globe, especially in poor countries. With nearly one in five Americans either out of work or underemployed, we must grab the momentum created by KORUS and act on additional trade agreements. These pacts offer lawmakers a chance to set aside ideology, work across party lines, and advance policies that will create jobs and grow the economy. If America is to restore its economic greatness, the White House and the business community must act in good faith as partners. Trade is an area we can work together and get something done for the American people.

2NC—Free Trade Add-On

SKFTA’s key to global free trade

Cooper and Manyin 7 (William and Mark, Specialists in International Trade and Finance and Asian Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Congressional Research Service, “The Proposed South Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (KORUS FTA),” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33435.pdf>)

In terms of broader U.S. trade policy, an FTA with Korea would build on the policy first introduced by then-USTR Robert Zoellick, “competitive liberalization,” that uses free trade agreements and multilateral trade agreements to encourage trading partners to remove trade and investment barriers and be a model for others. In that sense, the KORUS FTA would be a major step forward in the policy. It would be the largest U.S. FTA in terms of mutual trade and investment, since the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) went into effect in 1994. It would also respond to some critics of Bush Administration trade policy that the FTAs that the United States has entered into since NAFTA account for very little trade and yield relatively little in commercial benefits.

Free trade reduces the rate and destructiveness of conflicts globally

Griswold, 5 – director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute (Daniel, “Peace on earth? Try free trade among men,” 12-29-2005, http://www.freetrade.org/node/282)

Buried beneath the daily stories about car bombs and insurgents is an underappreciated but comforting fact during this Christmas season: The world has somehow become a more peaceful place. As one little-noticed headline on an Associated Press story recently reported, "War declining worldwide, studies say." According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the number of armed conflicts around the world has been in decline for the past half century. In just the past 15 years, ongoing conflicts have dropped from 33 to 18, with all of them now civil conflicts within countries. As 2005 draws to an end, no two nations in the world are at war with each other. The death toll from war has also been falling. According to the AP story, "The number killed in battle has fallen to its lowest point in the post-World War II period, dipping below 20,000 a year by one measure. Peacemaking missions, meanwhile, are growing in number." Those estimates are down sharply from annual tolls ranging from 40,000 to 100,000 in the 1990s, and from a peak of 700,000 in 1951 during the Korean War. Many causes lie behind the good news -- the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them -- but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role. Far from stoking a "World on Fire," as one misguided American author has argued, growing commercial ties between nations have had a dampening effect on armed conflict and war, for three main reasons. First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Those are assets that cannot be seized by armies. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by trading away what they can produce best at home. Of course, free trade and globalization do not guarantee peace. Hot-blooded nationalism and ideological fervor can overwhelm cold economic calculations. But deep trade and investment ties among nations make war less attractive. Trade wars in the 1930s deepened the economic depression, exacerbated global tensions, and helped to usher in a world war. Out of the ashes of that experience, the United States urged Germany, France and other Western European nations to form a common market that has become the European Union. In large part because of their intertwined economies, a general war in Europe is now unthinkable. In East Asia, the extensive and growing economic ties among Mainland China, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan is helping to keep the peace. China's communist rulers may yet decide to go to war over its "renegade province," but the economic cost to their economy would be staggering and could provoke a backlash among its citizens. In contrast, poor and isolated North Korea is all the more dangerous because it has nothing to lose economically should it provoke a war. In Central America, countries that were racked by guerrilla wars and death squads two decades ago have turned not only to democracy but to expanding trade, culminating in the Central American Free Trade Agreement with the United States. As the Stockholm institute reports in its 2005 Yearbook, "Since the 1980s, the introduction of a more open economic model in most states of the Latin American and Caribbean region has been accompanied by the growth of new regional structures, the dying out of interstate conflicts and a reduction in intra-state conflicts." Much of the political violence that remains in the world today is concentrated in the Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa -- the two regions of the world that are the least integrated into the global economy. Efforts to bring peace to those regions must include lowering their high barriers to trade, foreign investment, and domestic entrepreneurship. Advocates of free trade and globalization have long argued that trade expansion means more efficiency, higher incomes, and reduced poverty. The welcome decline of armed conflicts in the past few decades indicates that free trade also comes with its own peace dividend.

Trade Turns Case: Hegemony

Trade turns heg

Hormats ‘1—Vice Chairman, Goldman Sachs International, 01 (Robert D., “American Trade Policy: The Importance of Trade Promotion Authority,” Testimony Before the Committee on Finance, United Staes Senate, 20 Jun, http://www.senate.gov/~finance/062001rhtest.pdf)

Expanding global trade and investment over the last 50 years have provided enormous benefits for American workers, farmers, consumers and, businesses. We tend to take it for granted today, but this experience is in sharp contrast to the horrible economic mess the US and world got themselves into after World War I — when American leadership faltered. Protectionist measures and international financial instability were among the major factors that led to the Depression. We should not forget the lessons of this period — nor let our leadership of the global economy be derailed by internal divisions or by complacency that the world economy will work just fine whether the US is an effective leader or not! Nor should we let the current weakness in the US economy and the world economy block progress. Trade liberalization can provide a boost to growth. Reduction in many kinds of trade barriers is equivalent to a stimulative tax cut. Access to growing foreign markets has been a vital factor in America’s economic growth for several decades, especially for our most productive sectors, such as high technology, agriculture, high value added manufactured goods, entertainment and financial services. And competitive imports have reinforced the dynamism of our economy, while broadening consumer choice, and holding down the prices of many products, to the benefit of millions of households. Chairman Greenspan made this point eloquently in testimony before this committee earlier this year. US leadership in promoting trade liberalization has been essential to secure these benefits for the American people. It also has been vital to this country’s ability to remain a strong and effective leader on global political and security matters for the last 50 plus years. If we now turn our back on global trade leadership we will weaken our global political leadership as well. In recent years advocates of open, rules-based, transparent and nondiscriminatory trade — and supporters of American leadership in the world economy — have been on the defensive. The benefits of expanding trade and investment are too often neglected, while vocal criticism of US trade policy, the WTO and globalization tend to get more visibility and public attention. The role of a strong global economy in maintaining a strong American economy is too often ignored.

Link: Space Policy—Political Capital

Space policy is politically costly—requires massive presidential investment to overcome opposition

Powell 9 (Stewart M. Powell, “Potential Uphill Battle for NASA”, Houston Chronicle, 9/13/2009, <http://www.chron.com/disp/story.mpl/nation/6615751.html>)

NASA supporters are bracing for an uphill battle to get the extra funding needed to take on missions more ambitious than visits to the international space station. A high-level panel told President Barack Obama last week that the space program needs an infusion of about $3 billion more a year by 2014. That may be a tough sell, even though the amount could be considered spare change in a fast-spending capital where the White House and Congress are on track to dole out nearly $4 trillion this year to finance federal operations, including bailouts for Wall Street firms, banks and automakers. “The congressional agenda over the next year is going to be focused on cutting programs, not adding to them,” said Scott Lilly, a scholar at the Center for American Progress. Adding resources to the nation's $18.7 billion-a-year space program would require cuts in other areas, said Lilly, who doesn't think lawmakers are willing to make those trades. Rep. Pete Olson, R-Sugar Land, the ranking Republican on the House subcommittee that has jurisdiction over NASA, said wrangling the additional $3 billion a year would be “an enormous challenge — but one I am prepared to win.” Added Olson, whose district includes Johnson Space Center: “NASA doesn't require bailout funds — it needs the promised level of investment that previous Congresses have endorsed.” The 10-member panel of space experts led by retired aerospace executive Norman Augustine suggested extending U.S. participation in the $100 billion space station for five years, extending budgeting for the retiring shuttle fleet by six months, delaying plans for a 2020 return to the moon and extending the timeline for the next generation of manned spacecraft by two years at least until 2017. But the experts warned in their 12-page preliminary report to Obama on Tuesday that “meaningful human exploration” would be possible only under “a less constrained budget ramping (up) to approximately $3 billion per year” in additional spending by 2014. Former astronaut Sally Ride, a member of the committee, forecast $27.1 billion in additional funds would be needed over the next decade — a 27 percent increase over the $99.1 billion currently planned. Even before Obama publicly reacts to Augustine's report to map the next steps in the nation's manned space exploration, members of Congress are scrambling. “The immediate challenge goes beyond money to just getting NASA on the radar screen when everyone is focused on health care reform,” said a key congressional staffer involved in NASA issues. *Finding support* NASA supporters initially are targeting the Democratic leadership of appropriations subcommittees in the House and Senate with jurisdiction over NASA. Space advocates have an ally in Sen. Barbara Mikulski, D-Md., chairwoman of the Senate Appropriations Committee panel that handles space agency spending. But in the House, pro-NASA lawmakers expect a fight with Rep. Alan Mollohan, D-W.Va., chairman of the House Appropriations Committee panel that cut next year's NASA spending nearly $500 million below what Obama requested. Lawmakers are looking for a House-Senate conference committee to restore the funds that Mollohan cut before the Augustine panel completed its work. Aides to Sen. Bill Nelson, D-Fla., chairman of a Senate subcommittee that oversees NASA, said they have already identified six potential sources of additional NASA funding within the federal budget, including some of the $8 billion promised over the next decade to private energy firms to research fossil fuels and deep drilling for oil and gas. Lawmakers also are exploring the possibility of redirecting some of the two-year, $787 billion economic stimulus package from shovel-ready transportation construction projects and other federally subsidized programs into the NASA budget. The administration so far has only paid out $160 billion of the total, according to Vice President Joe Biden. “A lot of stimulus money has not been spent,” said Sen. John Cornyn, R-San Antonio. “We should redirect some of those stimulus funds to pay for enhancements to the NASA budget because I believe human space flight is so important.” Aerospace executives and veteran space experts are hoping for reliable year-to-year funding. “These are challenging economic times, but this is not the moment to turn away from leading a global space exploration effort,” said Dean Acosta, head of the Houston-based Coalition for Space Exploration. *President's influence* Presidential leadership will be essential to gaining an increase, emphasized John Logsdon, a space policy expert who served on the Shuttle Columbia Accident Investigation Board. “The president has to use some portion of his political capital to put forward an Obama space program.”

Link: Space Policy—Partisan

Congress is partisan over space issues

Space Politics ’11 (“Briefly: $1.4 million a day, a call for level-headed bipartisan leadership,” *Space Politics*, 3-24-11 < http://www.spacepolitics.com/2011/03/24/briefly-1-4-million-a-day-a-call-for-level-headed-bipartisan-leadership/> LV)

In an editorial today, Florida Today calls on Congress to fund commercial crew development as the best means to limit the impending gap in US human spaceflight capabilities. The paper notes that the current situation the US finds itself in, with the US reliant on Russia for access to the station for at least several years after the shuttle’s retirement this year, is an artifact of the original implementation of the Vision for Space Exploration back in 2004, which was endorsed by Congresses with both Republican and Democratic majorities. “In the hyper-partisan climate in Congress, the announcement brought familiar criticism from Republicans that the Obama administration is ceding U.S. human spaceflight to Russia,” the editorial states, referring to the latest NASA contract for Soyuz flights. “The rhetoric accomplishes nothing, further poisoning the atmosphere when level-headed bipartisan leadership is necessary to steer NASA through the post-shuttle transition.”

Space policy is driven by partisan politics—orbiter location proves

Space Politics ’11 (“Briefly: Obama visit; shuttle updates; ‘Moon mission’,” *Space Politics*, 4-22-11. < http://www.spacepolitics.com/2011/04/22/briefly-obama-visit-shuttle-updates-moon-mission/> LV)

President Obama also had something to say earlier this week about the placement of the space shuttles. A reporter for Dallas TV station WFAA asked the president in an interview earlier this weekif politics played a role in not awarding Houston a space shuttle orbiter when the fleet is retired later this year, passing over the city in favor of sites in New York, Los Angeles, outside Washington, and at the Kennedy Space Center in Florida. “That’s wrong,” the president said. “We had nothing to do with it. The White House has had nothing to do with it. There’s a whole commission, a whole process, and that’s how the decision was made.” (The exchange takes place about four minutes into the video linked to above.) In testimony last week before a Senate committee, NASA administrator Charles Bolden said that the decision was “free of any political involvement,” although he also said he had briefed people “close to the president” on the issue. The president’s statement has hardly assuaged critics of the decision. “Sadly, it seems partisan politics permeates this announcement**,**” Reps. Pete Olson and Ted Poe (R-TX) said in an CNN op-ed. Saying they are “demanding answers”, they added, “If, as we suspect, the measures were purely political, we will do everything in our power to make this right.” The two are among the 12 co-sponsors of HR 1536, which would override NASA’s selection and award Endeavour to Houston (giving Enterprise to LA and leaving New York empty-handed). They have not co-sponsored a competing bill, HR 1590, introduced by Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee (D-TX), that would require the Smithsonian to loan Discovery to Houston for 15 years.

Link: Space Exploration—Congress

New propulsion controversial

**MSNBC 6-18** (Dan Leone. “NASA selects new heavy-lift rocket, says sources,” *MSNBC*, 6-18-11 <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/43451526/ns/technology\_and\_science-space/> LV)

NASA’s plan would appear to address conflicting pressures the agency is facing on the SLS program. The NASA Authorization Act of 2010, signed by U.S. President Barack Obama in October, directs the agency to utilize shuttle infrastructure and Constellation technology and contracts to the maximum practical extentin developing the SLS, which would be used for astronaut missions to deep-space destinations. But in recent weeks, some lawmakers have urged NASA to solicit competitive bids for the propulsion elements of SLS.

Space programs recently pulled prove space policy unpopular

**MSNBC 6-18** (Dan Leone. “NASA selects new heavy-lift rocket, says sources,” *MSNBC*, 6-18-11 <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/43451526/ns/technology\_and\_science-space/> LV)

The NASA Authorization Act of 2010 directs the agency to field an SLS vehicle capable of placing 130 metric tons into low Earth orbit by 2016. In terms of capability the vehicle ordered up by Congress closely resembles the Ares 5 rocket designed by NASA as part of Constellation, a collection of hardware development efforts intended to replace the retiring space shuttle and eventually deliver astronauts to the surface of the Moon. Obama proposed canceling Constellation in his 2011 budget request, and NASA officially pulled the plug on the program June 10.

Congress has a vested interest in the status quo and will not pass new space policy

**Star Tribune 6-22** (Justin Kugler. “Give space program support, not grief,” *Star Tribune*, 6-22-11. < http://www.startribune.com/opinion/otherviews/124314369.html> LV)

President Obama proposed last year to continue with the retirement of the shuttle, begun by his predecessor, and to rescope the manned space program to focus on technology development and research for building an in-space transportation infrastructure. Under this new exploration architecture, the International Space Station would continue operating as a testbed for future missions, while commercial service providers would take over much of the Low Earth Orbit work so NASA could focus its resources on exploration technologies.To meet these new goals, the president did request a sustained budget increase for NASA over the next five years. Congress, led by members from states with a vested interest in continuing with the status quo, fought the president's proposal and refused to pass his budget for NASA. Instead, we were left with a continuing resolution that is only now allowing the agency to start new work.

Congress has been dismissing space capabilities

**Bonin 6-6** (Grant. “Human spaceflight for less: the case for smaller launch vehicles, revisited,” *The Space Review*, 6-6-11. < http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1861/1> LV)

While the private sector has quietly (or not so quietly) been working to address the issues of affordable and reliable access, others have struggled to address the issue at all. While NASA for its part has increasingly been embracing and assisting private initiatives in developing cheaper launch systems, there remain contingents in the agency and especially in Congress that continue to dismiss existing and emerging commercial capabilities, and who remain fixated on the belief that a heavy-lift launch vehicle (HLV) is the right and only way for human space exploration to occur. Decades of studies have called for the development of such a rocket—from the first President Bush’s Space Exploration Initiative (SEI) to the second President Bush’s Vision for Space Exploration (at least through the now defunct Constellation implementation of the Vision). But none have come to fruition since Apollo.

Link: Space Exploration—GOP

Republicans in the House and Senate agree that the budget should be frozen for space exploration

**Reuters 6-21** (Andy Sullivan, “Can U.S. budget players find common ground?-FACTBOX,” *Forex Yard*, 6-21-11. < http://www.forexyard.com/en/news/Can-budget-players-find-common-ground-2011-06-20T173742Z-FACTBOX-US> LV)

These steps were proposed in both President Barack Obama's budget and a plan drafted by House of Representatives Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan, which has been backed by the overwhelming majority of Republicans in both the House and Senate. \* FREEZE ANNUAL SPENDING. Stop the growth of annual spending programs, such as law enforcement, space exploration and the military, for several years. Savings: $580 billion to $1.589 trillion.

Link: Space Exploration—GOP

The GOP opposes spending on NASA—it’s spun as fiscally irresponsible

Smith 10 (Marcia, editor of Space Policy Online, “What the Election Means for NASA”, Space Policy Online, 11/3/2010, http://www.spacepolicyonline.com/pages/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=1204:what-the-election-means-for-nasa&catid=67:news&Itemid=27 The Republican takeover of the House is not good news for NASA.  It's not that Republicans don't like NASA.  As far as I can tell, just about everyone in the United States loves NASA.   But they love NASA more in good economic times than in bad, and these are really bad economic times.   The message from yesterday's election is not just that America is angry at Washington, but that Bill Clinton is still correct -- it's the economy, stupid. If Barack Obama wants to get reelected two years from now, he will have to join the bandwagon to cut federal spending that resonated so loudly with the electorate yesterday.   The $6 billion increase over 5 years he included for NASA in his FY2011 budget request was always just a proposal and it is difficult to believe that it can survive the current economic and political climate. As for Congress, the 2010 NASA authorization act did what most compromises do, split the difference.  Not only will the government subsidize the commercial sector to build a transportation system to take people to low Earth orbit (LEO), but it will also build a government system to take people to LEO and beyond.   That was unaffordable even with the President's $6 billion proposed increase; it surely is unaffordable now.  
NASA's space science programs are very popular with Congress and the public, but earth sciences have been a political football for a long time.   Many Republicans do not believe that climate change is human-induced and question why NASA needs to invest so much in earth science research.    With the White House and Senate still in Democratic hands, and Senator Barbara Mikulski still in the Senate to champion Goddard Space Flight Center and its earth science research programs, the news is not entirely gloomy.  Still, the President's requested increase for NASA's earth science program may encounter rough seas ahead instead of the smooth sailing it enjoyed this year.  
Democrats now are intent on regaining the House and keeping the White House in 2012, while the Republicans want to prove that they are the party of smaller, cheaper government and win the Senate and the White House.   Every agency is battening down the hatches against inevitable austerity.  My best guess is that if Congress passes an omnibus appropriations bill this year, the bottom line for NASA will read $19 billion, the same as the request, but there will be a significant across-the-board reduction for all the agencies at the back of the bill.   Such cuts are not uncommon, and usually are a fraction of a percent, but might well be more this time.  The FY2012 request for NASA, I bet, will be level funding. The Republicans won the House and made gains in the Senate because people are fearful of today's economy and what tomorrow may bring.  Spending money to send people to asteroids, as the President proposes, just doesn't have the allure needed to protect NASA from the impending federal spending cut tsunami. In many respects, this is yet another Back to the Future drill reminiscent of Mr. Clinton's tenure as President and then-NASA Administrator Dan Goldin's outwardly cheerful acquiescence to that Administration's budget cuts.   He crafted "faster, better, cheaper," which proved, as everyone says, that one can have two of the three, but not all.  
What does the election mean for NASA?  Another episode of trying to do too much with too little, I fear.  Not to mention another round - already - of debating what should be the future of human spaceflight.  Some think that a National Research Council (NRC) "Decadal Survey" for human spaceflight akin to those it does for space and earth sciences is the magic solution.  Sorry, it won't work.   Having the NRC do a study every 10 years of the human spaceflight program is a noble endeavor and worth doing, but it will not take human spaceflight off the political agenda.   Human spaceflight by its very nature appeals to the populace for reasons of national identity and aspirations that cannot be regulated by a sober, peer-reviewed, consensus document crafted even by the nation's most beloved thinkers. The space program belongs to the American people.   Advocates who count "regular Americans" among their ranks need to work together to better convey how investing in NASA satisfies the need for economic stability and inspiration.  Then those advocacy groups need to convert those beliefs into votes. NASA can't do it.   First, it has to do whatever the President and Congress tell it to do, and second, it is not allowed to proselytize itself.   This is an action item for the aerospace industry -- traditional and entrepreneurial -- and all the myriad advocacy groups to join together in making the case for space research and exploration. It's a difficult task.  Human spaceflight, in particular, appeals to people for mostly intangible reasons -- hope, curiosity, the drive to explore, national pride -- not because of pocketbook issues.   Without that connection, though, NASA, or at least the human spaceflight part of it, really may be lost this time.

Link: Space Technology

Commercializing space firms and technology development in space create clash between Congress and White House. Congress wants focus of heavy lift launcher in space policy,

**Whittington ’11** (Mark. “White House and Congress Clash Over NASA Funding, Space Cooperation with China,” *Yahoo News*, 5-8-11. <http://news.yahoo.com/s/ac/20110508/pl\_ac/8438927\_white\_house\_and\_congress\_clash\_over\_nasa\_funding\_space\_cooperation\_with\_china> LV)

Another indication that President Barack Obama's 2012 NASA funding request was in trouble occurred when at a hearing of the House Appropriations commerce, justice, science subcommittee on May 3.

White House science czar John Holdren came under some sharp questioning by Rep. Frank Wolf chairman of the subcommittee. The questioning revolved around the belief by Wolf that the administration is short changing the development of a heavy lift launcher and the Orion spacecraft that congress views as vital for the long term human exploration of space. The priorities of the administration include subsidies to commercial space firms, Earth science, and technology development. Wolf also questioned why NASA has not gotten a request for an increase of funding, even though some other science oriented agencies have gotten such requests. According to the account of the hearings on Space News, Wolf did not find Holdren's answers to be satisfactory. That suggests that there will be a renewed clash between the congress and the White House on space policy.

Link: Plutonium

Plutonium funding unpopular

**Space Politics 6-11** (“Another push for PU-238 funding,” *Space Politics*, 6-11-11. < http://www.spacepolitics.com/2011/06/15/another-push-for-pu-238-funding/> LV)

Plutonium 238 (Pu-238), the radioactive isotope used in the radioisotope thermoelectric generators (RTGs), is essential to a number of spacecraft missions, particularly those bound for the outer solar system. However, getting the relatively modest funding (no more than a few tens of millions of dollars a year) needed to restart Pu-238 production in the US to ensure that a supply of the isotope is available for future missions has been difficult in recent years. The latest push is taking place this week. The Obama Administration included $10 million each for NASA and the Department of Energy (DOE) to restart Pu-238 production, but a draft version of the Energy and Water appropriations bill in the House does not include that funding. The full House Appropriations Committee is scheduled to markup the bill in a hearing today. Emily Lakdawalla of The Planetary Society reported yesterday that the American Geophysical Union (AGU) is making a last-minute push to get the money added to the appropriations bill. In an email, the AGU said that Rep. Adam Schiff (D-CA), whose district includes JPL, plans to introduce an amendment to the bill to include the Pu-238 funding. (The AGU alert is not included in its list of “Science Policy Alerts” on its web site; it apparently went out to AGU members whose representatives are on the committee.) The AGU asked its members to contact their congressmen and ask them to support the Schiff amendment, providing a variety of talking points to use in those calls. Getting that amendment through may be tough, however. In the report accompanying the draft appropriations bill, the committee criticized the administration’s plan to split the Pu-238 costs between NASA and DOE. “The Committee remains concerned that the Administration continues to request equal funding from NASA and the Department of Energy for a project that primarily benefits NASA,” the report states at the top of page 98. “The Committee provides no funds for this project, and encourages the Administration to devise a plan for this project that more closely aligns the costs paid by federal agencies with the benefits they receive.”

Link: Unmanned Flights

Congress wants manned space flights

**Space Politics ’10** (“More reaction to potential NASA changes,” *Space Politics*, 1-28-10. < http://www.spacepolitics.com/2010/01/28/more-reaction-to-potential-nasa-changes/> LV)

The article also got several members of Congress to issue statements yesterday about potential changes. (Most of these statements were issued before the follow-up article last night, although that may not mollify many of their concerns.) Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-TX) issued a statement that was relatively mild. “I would strongly oppose any further cuts to human space flight funding that would make the United States dependent on foreign nations for manned space access,” she says. “I will be working with my colleagues in the Senate to provide additional guidance to NASA in conducting its human space flight planning and in developing the congressional response to the President’s budget, after it is submitted to the Congress.” Rep. Pete Olson (R-TX) was a little more strident in his opposition to potential changes. “If recent reports regarding the future of the Constellation program and the direction of NASA are true, then the President could not be more wrong to consider canceling it. The Constellation program is the best means for America to remain the global leader in human space flight,” he stated. “I will be working steadfastly with my colleagues to ensure that this short sighted proposal is not the final answer on the future of NASA.” mSen. Bill Nelson (D-FL), who is often described as an advisor to the White House on space issues, wanted to hear more from the president in last night’s State of the Union address. “On the downside, we’re going to have to get the president to do more for NASA. America’s global leadership in science and technology is at stake if we don’t maintain a more robust space exploration program. I’m still hopeful we’ll be able to do that.”

Republicans want focus on human spaceflight

**Space Politics ’11** (“Human spaceflight versus Earth sciences?” *Space Politics*, 2-9-11. < http://www.spacepolitics.com/2011/02/09/human-spaceflight-versus-earth-sciences/> LV)

A letter signed by several members of Congress is the latest evidence that a new battle line is forming over NASA funding: human spaceflight versus Earth sciences. In a letter to House Appropriations committee chairman Rep. Hal Rogers and CJS subcommittee chairman Frank Wolf, six Republican members of Congress asked the appropriators to prioritize NASA funding on what they consider to be the agency’s primary mission, human spaceflight. To do that, they argue that funding for NASA’s climate change research be redirected to human spaceflight accounts. “With your help, we can reorient NASA’s mission back toward human spaceflight by reducing funding for climate change research and reallocating those funds to NASA’s human spaceflight accounts, all while moving overall discretionary spending towards FY2008 levels,” the letter’s authors—Reps. Bill Posey (R-FL), Pete Olson (R-TX), Rob Bishop (R-UT), Jason Chaffetz (R-UT), Sandy Adams (R-FL), and Mo Brooks (R-AL)—argue.

Congress wants human spaceflight

**Space Politics ’11** (“Human spaceflight versus Earth sciences?” *Space Politics*, 2-9-11. < http://www.spacepolitics.com/2011/02/09/human-spaceflight-versus-earth-sciences/> LV)

A bigger issue, though, is that this letter may be indicative of a bigger battle some in Congress want to wage between human spaceflight and Earth science. Some members have openly expressed their skepticism about the validity of climate change research, questioning either the existence of global warming or the role of human activities in causing climate change. The letter to appropriators makes no judgment on the quality of validity of such research, only NASA’s role in supporting it, but some might see that unspoken argument there. For example, one of the letter’s signers, Rep. Brooks, said last week in regards to NASA funding that there would be “hearings soon on global warming” by the House science committee without going into more details. An attack on Earth sciences funding to support human spaceflight could create or reinvigorate opponents of human spaceflight programs, reminiscent of previous debates between human spaceflight and robotic space exploration advocates—a battle that the agency presumably would want to avoid.

Link: Asteroid Deflection

No one cares about asteroids—deflection requires massively unpopular spending

Nichols 6-3, (Jon Nichols, writer, scholar, and researcher with MA in writing from DePaul University, “And if a star should fall from the sky…” Strange Horizons, 6/3/2011, <http://strangehorizons.blogspot.com/2011/06/and-if-star-should-fall-from-sky.html>)

But that brings up another point. Are we even capable of detecting an approaching object in enough time? An asteroid similar in size to 2009 VA came close to Earth in November of 2009. It was detected about fifteen hours before the approach. There is currently a debate over just how affective our means are of detecting Near Earth Objects (NEO). An unavoidable factor in all of this is money. It takes a considerable budget to create and maintain an asteroid defense and our political leaders would hard pressed to sell this to a populace in need of jobs and healthcare. Sure, the big picture is one that threatens the entire human race, but most people are concerned only with their tunnel vision versions of reality…as I have lamented many a time.

Link: Moon Mission

No political will exists for a return to the moon

**Space Politics ’11** (“Briefly: Obama visit; shuttle updates; ‘Moon mission’,” *Space Politics*, 4-22-11. < http://www.spacepolitics.com/2011/04/22/briefly-obama-visit-shuttle-updates-moon-mission/> LV)

The curious headline of the day comes from National Journal: “Spending Bill Funds NASA Mission to the Moon”. The article reports on funding in the final FY11 continuing resolution that funds work on the Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle (MPCV) and Space Launch System (SLS), which combined will get no less than $3 billion in 2011. “The money will fund NASA’s Constellation Program,” the article claims, later referring to “the reauthorization of the Constellation Program” in the NASA authorization act last year. Strictly speaking, that’s not accurate: while MPCV is, to at least first order, a continuation of Orion, SLS is different from Ares, bigger in its initial iteration than Ares 1 but smaller than Ares 5. And a return to the Moon is not an overt goal of the administration’s exploration plan announced a year ago, which calls for instead a mission to a near Earth asteroid by 2025 and Mars orbit by the mid 2030s. Rep. Bill Posey (R-FL) said earlier this month he wants Congress to pass legislation that would “resume the goal” of a human return to the Moon.

Link: Mars Mission

Mars mission would be exceedingly costly and opposed by Congress—empirically proven

McCurdy et al. 7 (Howard E, Chairman, School of Public Affairs, American University; Chuck Atkins, Chief of Staff, House Committee on Science and Technology; Lori B. Garver, former Associate Administrator for Policy and Plans, NASA; and Marc Kaufman, Reporter, *The Washington Post* 5/14/7, Woodrow Wilson Center for International Scholars, “Congress and America’s Future in Space: Pie in the Sky or National Imperative?” http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=topics.event\_summary&event\_id=201072&topic\_id=1412)

America must continue with its scientific exploration of outer space, though the costs of building a space station on the Moon as a launch pad for sending astronauts to Mars and beyond—-estimated by some at over $400 billion--may be too much for Congress and the public to swallow. That was the consensus of a panel of experts at the Congress Project Seminar on Congress and America’s Future in Space. Professor Howard E. McCurdy of American University traced the history of America’s space program while exploding “the myth of presidential leadership in space.” According to that myth, says McCurdy, all the President has to do is move his lips and say the words, and it will be done. But that ignores both the independence of Congress and the ways of the NASA bureaucracy. Congress sometimes says “no” and sometimes, “go slow.” While Congress did largely defer to the President during the 1960s when John F. Kennedy called for putting a man on the moon within the decade, that began to change with the next stages of our space program. When President George W. Bush announced in 2004 his “Vision for Space Exploration,” which included building a Moon station for manned flights to Mars, he was recycling an idea that’s been kicked around for the last 50 years, says McCurdy. In fact, in 1989 Bush’s father called for the exact same thing, calling it the “Space Exploration Initiative.” But it died a natural death in Congress.

Link: China Cooperation

Congress does not want to cooperate with China for space exploration

**Whittington ’11** (Mark. “White House and Congress Clash Over NASA Funding, Space Cooperation with China,” *Yahoo News*, 5-8-11. <http://news.yahoo.com/s/ac/20110508/pl\_ac/8438927\_white\_house\_and\_congress\_clash\_over\_nasa\_funding\_space\_cooperation\_with\_china> LV)

The clash is not limited to funding and of space policy priorities. Space News also reports that the following day, on May 4, Holdren told members of the subcommittee that cooperation with China is seen as critical for prospects for long term space exploration, such as to Mars. This, mildly speaking, was not welcome news to members of the subcommittee. The problem is that China is currently ruled by a tyrannical regime that violates the human rights of its own people and is engaged in an imperial drive toward super power status at the expense of the United States. Congress has, in fact, passed a law prohibiting most forms of space and science cooperation with the People's Republic of China.

Congress just passed a bill prohibiting cooperation over space with China

**Space Politics ’11** (“What’s the future of US-China cooperation in space?” *Space Politics*, 5-5-11. < http://www.spacepolitics.com/category/congress/page/3/> LV)

One of the few specific space policy provisions included in the final continuing resolution that funds the federal government through the rest of fiscal year 2011 has to do with cooperation with China–or, rather, prohibiting cooperation with China. The CR prevents NASA and OSTP from using any funds to “develop, design, plan, promulgate, implement, or execute a bilateral policy, program, order, or contract of any kind to participate, collaborate, or coordinate bilaterally in any way with China or any Chinese-owned company” unless specifically authorized in a future law. That also prevents NASA from using any funds “to effectuate the hosting of official Chinese visitors at facilities belonging to or utilized by” the space agency. That would appear to put the brakes on any prospects for cooperation with China, at least through this fiscal year.

Congress does not want to cooperate with China because of its human rights record and risk to NASA funding

**Space Politics ’11** (“What’s the future of US-China cooperation in space?” *Space Politics*, 5-5-11. < http://www.spacepolitics.com/category/congress/page/3/> LV)

Holdren, Space News reported, has pragmatic reasons for seeking cooperation with China on space exploration in particular, including a future human expedition to Mars. “If China is going to be, by 2030, the biggest economy in the world… it could certainly be to our benefit to share the costs of such an expensive venture with them and with others,” he said. That did not sit well with some members of the subcommittee, including chairman Frank Wolf (R-VA), who has been very critical of China, in particular its human-rights record. An “irate” Wolf, as described by Space News, criticized the idea of Sino-American space cooperation, “repeatedly pounding a hand against the table top in front of him.” However, according to ScienceNow, Wolf appeared to accept Holdren’s constitutional explanation, asking for consultation on “a case-by-case basis” when any administration dealing with China might conflict with the law. By contrast, Rep. John Culberson (R-TX), another subcommittee member, was not assuaged at all by Holdren’s statements, warning Holdren that “you’re endangering your funding and NASA’s funding” by contemplating any cooperation with China. “You have a huge problem on your hands.”

Link: Space Militarization

Space militarization is politically costly—it’s entirely counter to long-established political and military norms

Sheehan ‘7 (Michael Sheehan, The International Politics of Space, ed. Everett C. Dolman and John Sheldon, School of Advanced Air and Space Studies at USAF Air, 2007, p. 121)

While there may be clear military rationales in favour of the weaponisation of space by the United States, it is a decision that would have considerable political implications. It is also true that to date there have always existed powerful cultural and political domestic obstacles in the United States to such a development. Even at the outset of the space age leading US politicians speculated on the idea of space as a force for peace rather than a theatre of war. House Majority Leader McCormack suggested in 1958 that the exploration of space had the potential to encourage a revived understanding ‘of the common links that bind the members of the human race together and the development of a strengthened sense of community of interest which quite transcends national boundaries’.84 President Kennedy similarly suggested that it was ‘an area in which the stale and sterile dogmas of the Cold War could be literally left a quarter of a million miles behind’.85 US National Space Policy states that the United States is committed to the exploration and use of outer space ‘by all nations for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of all humanity’.86 US national space policy does allow for the use of space for the purpose of national defence and security, but nevertheless, the weaponisation of space would seem to run counter to a very long-standing national policy. Similarly, the US National Security Strategy declares that uninhibited access to space and use of space are essential to American security. Space policy objectives include protecting US space assets, ‘preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction to space, and enhancing global partnerships with other space-faring nations across the spectrum of economic, political and security issues’.87 It is also notable that the US armed forces are aware of the need to respect the concept of space as a ‘global commons’, so that if ‘the United States impedes on the commons, establishing superiority for the duration of a conflict, part of the exit strategy for that conflict must be the return of space to a commons allowing all nations full access’.88 Current US military space doctrine is careful to emphasise the political implications of military operations in space and the need to be sensitive to legal issues. USDD 2-1.1, Counterspace Operations, insists that ‘in all cases, a judge advocate should be involved when considering specifi c counterspace operations to ensure compliance with domestic and international law and applicable rules of engagement’. 89

AT: No Link—NASA

NASA is perceived and opposed by Republicans—it’s seen as wasteful bureaucracy

IBT 6-14, Gabriel Perna, “Gingrich Rips NASA,” International Business Times, 6/14/2011, <http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/162962/20110614/nasa-newt-gingrich-science-innovate-presidential-candidacy.htm>

In a debate of possible Republican candidates for presidency, former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrinch tore into [NASA](http://www.ibtimes.com/topics/detail/192/nasa/).The debate was the first for the 2012 Presidential Election and featured seven Republican candidates, some unofficial and some official. Gingrinch, who has formerly made a bid for Presidency, was asked a question about the role government should play in future space exploration. Gingrich made it clear he wasn't a fan of the space agency. "Well, sadly - and I say this sadly, because I'm a big fan of going into space and I actually worked to get the shuttle program to survive at one point - [NASA](http://www.ibtimes.com/topics/detail/192/nasa/) has become an absolute case study in why bureaucracy can't innovate," Gingrich said.

"If you take all the money we've spent at NASA since we landed on the moon and you had applied that money for incentives to the private sector, we would today probably have a permanent station on the moon, three or four permanent stations in space, a new generation of lift vehicles. And instead what we've had is bureaucracy after bureaucracy after bureaucracy, and failure after failure." Gingrich went onto say NASA has stood in the way of scientific opportunities. He said NASA should be getting out of the way and encouraging the private sector. Interestingly enough, NASA is doing just that when it launches the next generation of space exploration in a few years. After the space shuttle program ends in July, NASA will use Russian Soyuz spacecraft for future years until it facilitates a program with private sector partners for space exploration. The agency has a goal of getting a manned spacecraft to Mars by the 2030s and to an asteroid by the 2020s. NASA has already invested millions into companies like Space Exploration Technologies, which have created their own space shuttles and have plans to launch private sector space missions. Two other Republican candidates, former Minnesota Governor Tim Pawlenty and former Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney also suggested NASA may be better off under the private sector.

NASA is bound by Congressional legislation—space development isn’t important to congress

**Bonin 6-6** (Grant. “Human spaceflight for less: the case for smaller launch vehicles, revisited,” *The Space Review*, 6-6-11. < http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1861/1> LV)

But in this regard, the agency is beholden to Congress. If the United States actually cares about developing space—not just exploring it or studying it, but developing it in earnest, with the end goal of having a large number of people living and working in space—it would mean being able to launch crew and cargo economically. The way to accomplish this is more activity and more competition, with as much commercial involvement as possible. A heavy-lift “Senate Launch System” is not consistent with these objectives, which really just affirms what we already know: that space development is not actually that important to Congress. But hopefully, at the behest of commercial efforts, a day will come when human space activities will flourish regardless of what’s important to Congress.

Congress wants NASA to focus on heavy-lift launcher – all possible funding will only go there

**Bonin 6-6** (Grant. “Human spaceflight for less: the case for smaller launch vehicles, revisited,” *The Space Review*, 6-6-11. < http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1861/1> LV)

The latest attempt at reviving heavy-lift is a congressional demand that NASA must develop a heavy-lift launcher by 2016 (which, as the Orlando Sentinel noted two weeks ago, will be “made of recycled parts of the shuttle”). Notwithstanding the fact that Congress has not authorized sufficient funds for the completion of such a vehicle, this latest attempt at forcing a large launcher into NASA’s plans will consume at least $10 billion over the next few years, and—if history is any indication—will likely result in nothing more than another paper rocket. As Lou Friedman put it here two weeks ago, “the situation in the United States with respect to [space access] is no different than if we had a space czar whose motive was to keep the country grounded. Why does it seem like we can never get a rocket policy for civil space exploration right?” (see “The dangers of a rocket to nowhere”, The Space Review, May 23, 2011)

AT: No Link—Agencies

Obama gets held accountable – voters blame the president for agency appointments

Peter M. Shane, Dean and professor of law at the University of Pittsburgh, “Political Accountability in a System of Checks and Balances: The Case of Presidential Review of Rulemaking,” Arkansas Law Review, 1995, lexis

The reason for the insignificance of the transparency argument is that, even without plenary power to second-guess all bureaucratic policy makers, the President may well be held generally and properly accountable for overall bureaucratic performance in any event. That is because voters know the President has appointed all key policy makers and the most important managers of executive affairs. The President's value structure is likely to dominate the bureaucracy even if he is not formally able to command all important policy decisions. Professor Abner Greene has recently catalogued a series of reasons why this is so: OMB reviews virtually all agency budgets; the Attorney General controls most agency litigation; the President's support may be critical to an agency in its negotiations with Congress. For these reasons, Presidents do not inevitably have less influence over "independent" agencies than they do over "purely executive" establishments

Political visibility means Obama is associated with the plan

Michael Fitts, professor of law at University of Pennsylvania, 19 Univ. Penn L. Rev, 1996, lexis

To the extent that the modern president is subject to heightened visibility about what he says and does and is led to make increasingly specific statements about who should win and who should lose on an issue, his [or her] ability to mediate conflict and control the agenda can be undermined. The modern president is supposed to have a position on such matters as affirmative action, the war in Bosnia, the baseball strike, and the newest EPA regulations, the list is infinite. Perhaps in response to these pressures, each modern president has made more speeches and taken more positions than his predecessors, with Bill Clinton giving three times as many speeches as Reagan during the same period. In such circumstances, the president is far less able to exercise agenda control, refuse to take symbolic stands, or take inconsistent positions. The well-documented tendency of the press to emphasize the strategic implications of politics exacerbates this process by turning issues into zero-sum games.

Political Capital = Finite

Political capital is finite—controversy wastes it

Gerson ‘10 (Michael Gerson, “When it comes to politics, Obama's ego keeps getting in the way,” Washington Post, 12/17/10, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/12/16/AR2010121604039.html>)

In some areas - such as education reform or the tax deal - Obama's governing practice is better than his political skills. But these skills matter precisely because political capital is limited. The early pursuit of ambitious health-care reform was a political mistake, as former chief of staff Rahm Emanuel internally argued. But every president has the right to spend his popularity on what he regards as matters of principle. Political risks, taken out of conviction with open eyes, are an admirable element of leadership. Yet political errors made out of pique or poor planning undermine the possibility of achievement. Rather than being spent, popularity is squandered - something the Obama administration has often done.

AT: Winners Win

Winners lose—Obama presidency proves

John Harris and Carol Lee, "Obama's First Year," Politico, 1/20/2010, http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=4DF829C9-18FE-70B2-A8381A971FA3FFC9

Obama believed that early success would be self-reinforcing, building a powerful momentum for bold government action. This belief was the essence of the White House’s theory of the “big bang” — that success in passing a big stimulus package would lead to success in passing health care, which in turn would clear the way for major cap-and-trade environmental legislation and “re-regulation” of the financial services sector — all in the first year. This proved to be a radical misreading of the dynamics of power. The massive cost of the stimulus package and industry bailouts — combined with the inconvenient fact that unemployment went up after their passage — meant that Obama spent the year bleeding momentum rather than steadily increasing public confidence in his larger governing vision. That vision was further obscured for many Americans by the smoke from the bitter and seemingly endless legislative battle on Capitol Hill over health care.

Controversial legislation doesn’t build momentum

Mann 10 (Thomas Mann, Senior Fellow for Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution, “American Politics on the Eve of the Midterm Elections”, November 2010, http://www.brookings.edu/articles/2010/11\_midterm\_elections\_mann.aspx)

HIGHLY POLARISED That perception of failure has been magnified by the highly contentious process by which Obama’s initiatives have been adopted in Congress. America has in recent years developed a highly polarised party system, with striking ideological differences between the parties and unusual unity within each. But these parliamentary-like parties operate in a governmental system in which majorities are unable readily to put their programmes in place. Republicans adopted a strategy of consistent, unified, and aggressive opposition to every major component of the President’s agenda, eschewing negotiation, bargaining and compromise, even on matters of great national import. The Senate filibuster has been the indispensable weapon in killing, weakening, slowing, or discrediting all major legislation proposed by the Democratic majority.

Space Exploration Inevitable

Political battles irrelevant – push for space exploration is inevitable

**Florida Today 6-24** (John Kelly, “Politics won’t stop space innovation,” *Florida Today*, 6-24-11 < http://www.floridatoday.com/article/20110626/COLUMNISTS0405/106260312/John-Kelly-Politics-won-t-stop-space-innovation> LV)

The military hasn't stopped wanting to own space. One public sign of the Pentagon's interest in revolutionizing space flight is its recent work on an unmanned mini-shuttle (one that basically builds on a project NASA helped develop and then gave up on, obviously prematurely). A bigger one is a new century-long, Nobel Prize-style project called the 100-Year Starship Study. The military's secretive skunk-works arm and NASA's most innovative center -- Ames Research Center near Silicon Valley -- are trying to spur private companies, scientists and even government experts to tackle the big technological questions tied to development of a spaceship that could visit another star system. They're not focusing on how to land on the moon -- again -- or even on desolate Mars. They're chasing the big stuff. Finding Earth-like, life-supporting planets around other stars. Trying to "communicate" with those planets. How people might survive years-long treks in space. Propulsion systems more akin to Star Trek and Star Wars than incremental upgrades to existing technology. They're shooting for figuring out how to send people to another solar system. So don't lose hope for space exploration while you watch NASA and the politicians dawdle and fight. There are people out there, even some within NASA, whose need to innovate won't be contained by the bureaucracy.

Space Exploration Popular—Congress

Congress has mandated further space exploration

**MSNBC 6-18** (Dan Leone. “NASA selects new heavy-lift rocket, says sources,” *MSNBC*, 6-18-11 <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/43451526/ns/technology\_and\_science-space/> LV)

Facing mounting pressure to bring industrial competition to a congressionally mandated heavy-lift rocket development program, NASA has tentatively selected a vehicle design featuring solid-fueled, side-mounted boosters that eventually could be replaced with liquid-fueled engines, according to U.S. industry and congressional sources.

Congress wants follow-up programs in space. Plan key.

**Florida Today 6-24** (John Kelly, “Politics won’t stop space innovation,” *Florida Today*, 6-24-11 < http://www.floridatoday.com/article/20110626/COLUMNISTS0405/106260312/John-Kelly-Politics-won-t-stop-space-innovation> LV)

The agency is under assault from Congress for not fielding a shuttle follow-up program. The politicos are too focused on micromanaging the "ship-building" or, more specifically, rocketship-building that best benefits their state or district or -- cynics might say -- their favorite contractors. Little of their guidance seems focused on what makes the most sense for the United States or humankind.

NASA Funding Popular—Congress

Lawmakers want NASA to spend money

**MSNBC 6-18** (Dan Leone. “NASA selects new heavy-lift rocket, says sources,” *MSNBC*, 6-18-11 <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/43451526/ns/technology\_and\_science-space/> LV)

Lawmakers appropriated $1.8 billion in 2011 for the SLS, and NASA, which has been accused of dragging its feet on the program, said June 14 it has released approximately $1.4 billion of that total.

Winners Win

Winners win—stimulus proves

Jonathan Singer, “By Expending Capital, Obama Grows His Capital,” My Direct Democracy, 3 March 2009, http://mydd.com/2009/3/3/by-expending-capital-obama-grows-his-capital

From the latest NBC News-Wall Street Journal survey: Despite the country's struggling economy and vocal opposition to some of his policies, President Obama's favorability rating is at an all-time high. Two-thirds feel hopeful about his leadership and six in 10 approve of the job he's doing in the White House. "What is amazing here is how much political capital Obama has spent in the first six weeks," said Democratic pollster Peter D. Hart, who conducted this survey with Republican pollster Bill McInturff. "And against that, he stands at the end of this six weeks with as much or more capital in the bank." Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result. Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration. So at this point, with President Obama seemingly benefiting from his ambitious actions and the Republicans sinking further and further as a result of their knee-jerked opposition to that agenda, there appears to be no reason not to push forward on anything from universal healthcare to energy reform to ending the war in Iraq.

Winners win—Health care proves

“Obama's presidency bolstered by political success,” International Institute for Strategic Studies, Vol. 16, Comment 11, April 2010, http://www.iiss.org/publications/strategic-comments/past-issues/volume-16-2010/april/obamas-presidency-bolstered-by-political-success/

The health-care bill passed without a single Republican vote, underscoring the fiercely partisan nature of contemporary American politics and increasing scepticism about Obama's ability to usher in the epoch of 'post-partisan' government about which he had spoken hopefully during his campaign and early days in office. To be sure, 'Tea Party' Republicans have continued to attack the new law as 'socialist' and vowed its repeal after anticipated Republican victories in midterm elections in November 2010, while 14 state attorneys-general have filed lawsuits challenging its constitutionality. But such threats and challenges are probably overblown. Obama's display of political muscle in pushing through the most significant and controversial piece of domestic US legislation since the 1960s has reinvigorated his presidency. It has ended a stream of media articles suggesting that in spite of his rhetoric he was proving politically ineffectual, and overly intellectual in his approach to office.

No Political Capital

Political capital is shot—economic and foreign policy blunders

Mead 6-20 (Walter Russell Mead, Debate God and professor of Foreign Affairs and Humanities at Bard College, “Here’s How Obama Can Save His Presidency,” Business Insider, 6/20/2011, <http://www.businessinsider.com/heres-how-obama-can-save-his-presidency-2011-6>)

Nevertheless it seems increasingly clear that the Obama presidency has lost its way; at home and abroad it flounders from event to event, directionless and passive as one report after another “unexpectedly” shows an economy that refuses to heal. Most recently, the IMF has cut its growth forecast for the United States in 2011 and 2012. With growth predicted at 2.5 percent this year and 2.7 percent next, unemployment is unlikely to fall significantly before Election Day. On the same day, the latest survey of consumer sentiment shows an “unexpectedly sharp” dip in consumer confidence. The economy is not getting well; geopolitically, the US keeps adding new countries to the bomb list, but the President has fallen strangely silent about the five wars he is fighting (Iraq, Afghanistan, tribal Pakistan, Libya and now Yemen).

Debt Ceiling—Won’t Pass

Debt reform won’t pass

**Bowman 6-26** (Michelle. “Obama to Lead US Debt Negotiations,” *Voice of America*, 6-26-11. < http://www.voanews.com/english/news/usa/Obama-to-Lead-US-Debt-Negotiations-124566339.html> LV)

Lawmakers of both parties agree that America’s fiscal outlook must improve. But a bipartisan solution remains elusive. Republicans are demanding deep spending cuts with no tax increases, a position that Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell says he will present to Mr. Obama at the White House. “We have been spending way too much. We have a spending problem. We do not have a problem because we tax too little," he said.

Won’t pass – Republicans are skeptical of Obama

**AFP ’11** (“Political theater clouds US debt ceiling vote,” *Activist Post*, 5-31-11. < http://www.activistpost.com/2011/05/political-theater-clouds-us-debt.html> LV)

But they are still sharply at odds about how to make the savings. Republicans claim Obama is interested in preserving big government programs and wants tax increases which would harm the economy.

No debt ceiling

Angle Fox News 7/5 (Jim, “Senate Gives Up July 3 Recess to Vote on Symbolic Millionaires Resolution,” <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2011/07/05/obama-to-provide-update-on-debt-ceiling-talks/>)

The Senate returned to Congress Tuesday after canceling its week-long July 4 recess to work on a deal to raise the debt limit, but so far on the schedule is a nonbinding resolution by Democrats expressing a sense of the Senate that households earning $1 million or more need to make "a more meaningful contribution to the deficit reduction effort." Already a non-starter for Republicans, the august body won't even vote on the resolution until later this week but the timing could be affected by President Obama's meeting with leaders from both parties at the White House Thursday, a meeting the president said Tuesday was intended "to drive toward a final agreement" on the terms of increasing the debt limit beyond its $14.3 trillion ceiling. Obama also rejected talks of a short-term debt limit increase that would give negotiators more time for a long-term deal, saying Congress should not "kick the can down the road." "I don't think the American people sent us here to avoid tough problems," he said. "It's in fact what drives them nuts about Washington, when both parties simply take the path of least resistance. And I don't want to do that here." "I believe we have a big opportunity to do something big," he added. "To tackle our deficit in a way that forces our government to live within its means, that puts our economy on a stronger footing for the future and still allow us to invest in that future." But the White House and Republicans so far have been unable to overcome the sticking point on slashing tax deductions and subsidies for upper-income earners and corporations. Democrats say tax increases must be included in any deficit-reduction deal. Republicans say no increases, period. "We're not dealing just with talking points about corporate jets or other 'loopholes,'" House Speaker John Boehner said in a statement after the president's remarks. "The legislation the president has asked for -- which would increase taxes on small businesses and destroy more American jobs -- cannot pass the House, as I have stated repeatedly." "I'm happy to discuss these issues at the White House, but such discussions will be fruitless until the president recognizes economic and legislative reality," he said. House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, R-Va., who said he will attend Thursday's meeting, blamed Democrats for the stalemate. "Contrary to the president's unserious claims last week, House Republicans aren't holding up a potential deal due to special interest tax loopholes, this is about raising taxes on families and small businesses in a stagnant economy when we should be focused on growth and job creation," Cantor spokeswoman Laena Fallon said in a statement The Treasury has set an Aug. 2 deadline for getting a deal done or the nation possibly facing default on its loans for the first time. "This crisis is not a new problem. It's been around for months," Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., said Tuesday. "We no longer have months or even weeks to avert this catastrophe. We have days." That's why Senate Republicans expressed disappointment in Reid's nonbinding resolution supporting tax hikes. "Instead of bringing forth a budget plan, a debt limit proposal, or a Balanced Budget Amendment, the majority leader is wasting valuable time on a political stunt that will do nothing to substantively address our debt problem,"

Debt Ceiling—Won’t Pass

Debt ceiling dead on arrival

Detroit Free Press 7/3 (“Doubtful Debt Deal Done Soon,” http://www.freep.com/article/20110703/NEWS07/107030536/Doubtful-debt-deal-done-soon)

President Barack Obama and Congress likely will find it difficult, if not impossible, to reach a broad deal to raise the U.S. borrowing limit and slash spending by Aug. 2. **Even if** quarreling lawmakers can agree this month, it is doubtful that Congress can write it up in binding fashion and pass it by a month from now. That's when the government will start running short of money to pay the nation's bills, the Treasury Department warned anew on Friday. Congress could end up having to vote at least twice on the politically poisonous issue of raising the debt ceiling, now $14.3 trillion, to avoid a first-ever government default. The first vote would be on an interim raise. That would give lawmakers time to wrap up a grand bargain allowing the government to go trillions of dollars deeper into debt in exchange for spending cuts and possibly higher taxes. "It will take time, and that is a bit troublesome," said Sen. Jon Kyl, R-Ariz., who represented Senate Republicans in budget talks led by Vice President Joe Biden. **Veterans of previous budget deals** say there's no way Obama and Congress can meet the Aug. 2 deadline -- even if a broad overall agreement is reached in the next two weeks. It could take weeks more for lawmakers and staff aides to implement a deal. Then, lawmakers would need time to examine and digest the legislation. **And that's assuming everything goes according to plan** -- that the debt-budget pact doesn't get blown up by a revolt from tea party activists on the right or frustrated Democrats on the left. **That's a huge "if**."

Won’t pass

Detroit Free Press 7/3 (“Doubtful Debt Deal Done Soon,” http://www.freep.com/article/20110703/NEWS07/107030536/Doubtful-debt-deal-done-soon)

It took many months to move a 2005 budget bill -- which ended up cutting about $100 billion over 10 years -- through the system, and that was when Republicans controlled the White House and all the congressional committees that drew up the legislation. Now, GOP-controlled House panels and Democratic-led Senate committees have to write an agreement hatched by Obama and the top leaders in both parties. Battles are unavoidable. The House and Senate Agriculture committees, for example, will be asked to implement farm subsidy cuts they either disagree with or would prefer to do in a more deliberate fashion later. The difficulty is heightened by the desire to generate a package of deficit cuts in the range of $2.4 trillion over the coming decade to balance a similar increase in the debt limit -- one large enough to keep the government afloat past the November 2012 election. Discussions led by Biden focused on more than $1 trillion in savings, most from the pot of money assigned to cabinet agency budgets passed each year by Congress. But the types of additional ideas that could get lawmakers to the $2-trillion-plus target, such as cuts to Medicare providers or targeted tax increases, **invite sparring from industry groups and their defenders on Capitol Hill**. Another idea, a new government cost-of-living adjustment that would affect both Social Security benefits and tax brackets, is simpler to draft but may be too big a lift politically. **So what are the chances of threading the needle and getting a $2.4-trillion debt pact passed by Aug. 2? "You can't,**" said Bill Hoagland, a former Senate GOP veteran of budget deals dating to the Reagan administration. "All I can think here is that if you had an agreement in principle, that then you would have an agreement to vote on a temporary increase in the statutory debt limit while the details are worked out and the legislative language is put together."

Debt Ceiling—Won’t Pass

No debt limit bill—impossible

Beutler TPM News 6/29 (Brian, “Schumer to Boehner: If You Think you Can Raise The Debt Limit Without Dem Support, You’re Dreaming,” http://tpmdc.talkingpointsmemo.com/2011/06/schumer-to-boehner-if-you-think-you-can-raise-the-debt-limit-without-new-tax-revenue-youre-dreaming.php)

Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-NY) says Republican leaders are kidding themselves if they think they'll prevail in their bid to keep new tax revenues out of a grand bargain to lift the nation's borrowing limit. And to prove it, he says, look no further than the House of Representatives. "Speaker Boehner should realize we're in a different world than we were even a few months ago," Schumer told reporters at the Capitol Wednesday. "He needs Democrats to pass a bill through the House." A number of Republican House members have said they won't vote to raise the debt limit at all, or only under certain, highly partisan circumstances. Schumer's math suggests that means he'll need Democratic votes to pass a viable debt limit bill, and that means new revenues will have to be part of the equation. "So for Speaker Boehner to say as was mentioned before that he doesn't have the votes for [new revenues] -- well, he doesn't have the votes if he doesn't have revenues. Because he's not going to get Democratic votes without revenues, and he doesn't have enough Republican votes on his own to cast it," Schumer said. It's possible Boehner could pass a debt limit hike without Democratic support, if he attached key conservative wish-list items to it. But that would be a dead-on-arrival package in the Senate, and that would be a recipe for a default. Inevitably, it seems he'll need to turn to Democrats for votes. "That, my friends, is a major difference between this and the [six-month spending bill]. The House can't just lob things over to us if they don't have the ability to do so in their caucus," Schumer said. Nevertheless, GOP leaders are digging in their heels. "The President is sorely mistaken if he believes a bill to raise the debt ceiling and raise taxes would pass the House," said House Speaker John Boehner in response to President Obama's call for new revenues Wednesday. "The votes simply aren't there - and they aren't going to be there." Congress is running out of time to lift the debt ceiling -- and Schumer says they may have less time than they think. "Wall Street tells me, first that August 2 is the deadline, and second even coming the day before it or two days before it -- it's not like the [six-month spending bill]," Schumer said. "It risks real problems, because this is not totally contained within the government. If the government shuts down, that's the government. This involves an outside player -- a very mystical, magical player called the credit markets. And if the credit markets get spooked, whether it's August 2 or July 29, there is no recuperation." Many rank and file Republicans say they'd like to see the debt limit attached to a Balanced Budget Amendment. But amending the Constitution first requires a two-thirds majority in both chambers. So while Republicans in both chambers line up in lock-step behind the BBA, they'll likely have to satisfy themselves with a test vote on the issue.

Debt Ceiling—Won’t Pass—AT: Special Procedures

Special procedures push it pass the August 2nd deadline

Detroit Free Press 7/3 (“Doubtful Debt Deal Done Soon,” http://www.freep.com/article/20110703/NEWS07/107030536/Doubtful-debt-deal-done-soon)

Any legislation cutting so much -- including farm subsidies, federal health care programs and federal retirement benefits -- is going to be hard for many lawmakers to digest. And with the vote likely to be on a knife's edge in both the House and Senate, the leverage of individual lawmakers to protect parochial interests is magnified. The 2005 debate, for example, featured numerous power plays, such as a move by Sen. Norm Coleman, R-Minn., to jettison cuts to sugar subsidies and a last-minute push by Ohio Republicans to reverse Medicaid cuts that would have hit Buckeye state manufacturers of oxygen equipment. There's another consideration. Should Congress employ special budget procedures that would allow it to pass the debt limit bill with a simple majority in the Senate, or should it move more quickly but have the measure, already unpopular, be subject to a filibuster requiring 60 votes to overcome? Avoiding a filibuster would require both the House and Senate to first pass a blueprint of the deal in the form of a resolution setting savings targets for various committees to deliver within a set time. Then the two chambers would have to pass the deal itself in the form of binding legislation. Importantly, Senate debate could feature votes on dozens of amendments -- including "poison pills" offered by both sides for political gain. Using this filibuster-proof but time-consuming procedure means Congress would definitely bust the Aug. 2 deadline. But the alternative means gathering 60 votes in the polarized Senate, also difficult. For veterans of the process like former GOP Senate aide Eric Ueland, the puzzle doesn't fit together -- at least not by the close of the Aug. 2 window. "The system will only produce what the system can produce," Ueland said. "And it's not $2.4 trillion."

Debt Ceiling—UQ o/w Link

Congress has always raised debt ceiling, just using it as leverage for other issues

**AP ’11** ( “Q&A: What happens if Congress doesn’t approve a debt limit increase?” *Associated Press*, 5-16-11. < http://www2.tbo.com/news/politics/2011/may/16/q-amp-a-what-happens-if-congress-doesnt-approve-a--ar-207925/> LV)

Congress has always ended up raising the debt ceiling before a financial crackup. Republicans, many of them elected in November on a pledge to slash spending, are betting that the debt-ceiling deadline offers leverage to demand deep budget cuts from the Obama administration.

Debt Ceiling—No Impact

No impact to debt limit DA

Morici Professor of Economics at University of Maryland and Former Chief Economist at the U.S. International Trade Commission 7/5 (Peter, “A Way Around the Debt-Limit Impasse,” <http://www.baltimoresun.com/news/opinion/oped/bs-ed-debt-limit-20110701,0,442728.story>,)

Contrary to conventional wisdom, the United States does not have to default on its debt, and the Social Security and Medicare checks can continue to go out, even if Republicans and President Barack Obama cannot strike a deal to raise the debt ceiling by Aug. 2. Though the government cannot borrow additional money, it still has tax revenues equal to about 55 percent of expenses — $2.2 trillion against expenses equal to about $3.8 trillion, for a $1.6 trillion deficit. With those tax revenues, Washington can fund interest on the national debt, Social Security, Medicaid and crucial national defense responsibilities. With the interest on the debt honored, the government can sell new bonds to replace bonds that come due without piercing the statutory debt limit. Under this scenario, interest, benefits to seniors and defense would absorb virtually all tax revenues. It would appear the other functions of government would have to shut down — but the administration has other options. The Treasury has the power print money to pay its bills. That would create the danger of too much money in the hands of the public and, thus, inflation, but the Federal Reserve has options to neutralize this problem. The Fed holds on its balance sheet about $2.6 trillion in securities, mostly Treasury bonds. As the Treasury prints money to pay its bills, the Fed could sell bonds to the public to keep the amount of money in circulation from rising. How? Remember that the money supply is currency the public holds in its wallets and deposited in checkbooks — but the statutory debt limit applies to Treasury bonds held by the public and the Fed. At $1.6 trillion a year, the process of the Treasury paying its bills by printing money and the Fed selling off bonds to absorb the excess cash in circulation could keep the government running past the next election. Also, since 2007, government spending has jumped $1.1 trillion, but only $200 billion was needed to cover inflation — the $900 billion additional was new programs and benefits and higher pay. That has increased federal spending's share of gross domestic product from 19.6 percent to more than 25 percent. Temporarily slicing that additional government spending by $450 billion, by executive order, would likely stand up in court as an emergency measure. It would be good politics for both sides — either the president is right and Americans would see how painful it is to cut government that much, or Republicans would be able to point that we are better off. The Treasury would have to print about $1.2 trillion a year in new money, and the Fed would sell an equal amount of securities from its balance sheet; that maneuver would take us until a new Congress is seated and a reelected President Obama or his successor has a clear mandate. Kicking the can again? Perhaps, but in 2012, both the president and his opponent would have to table specific alternatives for slashing the deficit and restoring normal operations, and the winner would emerge with a mandate for his plan. Right now, neither side is offering credible plans. The president's taxes on the rich and other schemes would only slash at best $150 billion annually from the $1.6 trillion deficit, and the Republicans about a similar amount in spending cuts they have managed to propose. Neither side is talking about harnessing the rapidly rising prices the government pays for health care — both sides just talk about trimming benefits a bit or the pain of it. The United States pays double, or more, than European governments for drugs, and suffers from large disadvantages in insurance administration, hospital efficiency and tort costs. Regulating those prices is a tar baby no one in Congress or the White House wants to put his arms around — but we are not getting out of this mess without doing so. Ditto for retirement ages for Social Security and the vast array of federal pensions and state pensions the federal government indirectly helps finance. The absence of frank discussion of financing options beyond Aug. 2 is the fault of two men. Though Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner serves at the pleasure of the president, and Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke must answer frequently to Congress, both men have a responsibility to articulate the genuine budget and economic challenges before the nation, and both men can easily find other satisfying and better paying jobs in a pinch. In similar crises, past cabinet members have stepped up — consider the conduct of senior Justice officials in the last days of the Nixon administration, or Alan Greenspan's willingness to talk frankly about federal policies. Secretary Geithner needs to draft plans to keep the government going and be quietly frank with political leaders about those plans. And Chairman Bernanke would then concur with how the Fed can respond. Sadly, Messrs. Geithner and Bernanke are shirking the responsibilities.

SKFTA—UQ—Won’t Pass (TAA)

Disagreement over TAA impedes free trade passage

Washington Times 7-7 (Tim Devaney, “Partisan rift stalling free-trade pacts,” Washington Times, 7/7/2011, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jul/7/partisan-rift-stalling-free-trade-pacts/>)

Lawmakers on Capitol Hill on Thursday clashed over long-delayed free-trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama, with Republicans balking at an Obama administration demand to attach money for a program to aid American workers as a part of the package. Democrats on the House Ways and Means Committee warned they would vote against the trade pacts - the first major free-trade deals to move forward under Mr. Obama - unless funds for the controversial Trade Adjustment Assistance program were also included to protect workers who lose their jobs because of increased imports. But Republicans on the Senate Finance Committee, who last week boycotted a vote on the issue, stood firm against legislation to move forward the South Korea deal, after the majority Democrats included the TAA funding on a straight 13-11 party-line vote. “I support the South Korea trade-implementing bill and want it to pass,” Sen. Orrin G. Hatch of Utah, the committee’s ranking Republican said. “But I cannot condone this abuse of [the president’s trade-negotiating authority] or turn a blind eye to dubious domestic spending programs.” By the end of the day, the Senate committee had approved a version of the trade bill with the TAA money included, while the House Ways and Means Committee approved a version without the funds.

SKFTA—UQ—Won’t Pass (South Korea)

Won’t pass in South Korea—opposition parties want to renegotiate

Korea Times 6-29 (Kang Hyun-kyung, “EU free trade pact sparks debate on KORUS FTA,” Korea Times, 6/29/2011, <http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2011/06/116_89863.html>)

A foreign diplomat said Tuesday, “Obviously, in terms of economic arguments, commercial arguments, the United States is going to have a disadvantage.” But the diplomat, speaking on condition of anonymity, implied that politicians engaging in partisan politics should refrain from undermining their countries’ economic gains. “To be honest, the problems both in the National Assembly here and the U.S. Congress are far more political than economic,” he noted. In Korea, the main opposition Democratic Party (DP) teamed up with three other minor parties to stop the ratification of the KORUS FTA which is pending at the National Assembly Foreign Affairs Committee. These opposition parties demanded that negotiators of the two countries need to sit down again to fix what they called “hazardous clauses” that will negatively affect the job security of farmers and service sector workers.

SKFTA—AT: Relations Impact

Doesn’t solve relations – trade disputes

Cooper et.al. 9 William, Specialist in intenational trade and finance, Mark Manyin Specialist in East Asian Affairs, Remy Jurenas Apeicialist in agriculutural policy, Michaela D. Platzer soecialist in industrial orgqanizations and business “The Proposed U.S.-South Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS FTA): Provisions and Implications” June 17, 2009, Congressional Report Service Special report to Congress

Increased economic interaction between the United States and South Korea has been accompanied by numerous disagreements over trade policies. In general, U.S. exporters and trade negotiators identify the lack of transparency of South Korea’s trading and regulatory systems as the most significant barriers to trade with South Korea in almost every major product sector. Many U.S. government officials also complain that Seoul continues to use government regulations and standard-setting powers to discriminate against foreign firms in politically sensitive industries, such as automobiles and telecommunications. Another major cross-sectoral complaint is that rigidities in the South Korean labor market, such as mandatory severance pay, raise the cost of investing and doing business. Finally, the United States and other countries have pressed South Korea to open further its agricultural market, which is considered one of the most closed among members of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development(OECD).16 Many of these issues arose during the KORUS FTA negotiations.

SKFTA—AT: Alliance Impact

Not key to the alliance

Cooper et.al. 9 William, Specialist in intenational trade and finance, Mark Manyin Specialist in East Asian Affairs, Remy Jurenas Apeicialist in agriculutural policy, Michaela D. Platzer soecialist in industrial orgqanizations and business “The Proposed U.S.-South Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS FTA): Provisions and Implications” June 17, 2009, Congressional Report Service Special report to Congress

Although the FTA’s utility as an acute salve for the alliance has been reduced, some argue it could help to boost the alliance, over the medium and longer term, by deepening bilateral economic and political ties. Entering into an FTA, some argue, is a way to help reorient the alliance to adapt to the changes on the Korean Peninsula and in East Asia. However, in concrete terms, it is difficult to see how the KORUS FTA would make a significant difference in the strategic relationship, as it is unlikely to alter either country’s fundamental interests on the Peninsula or in Northeast Asia.

SKFTA—AT: Korea War Impact

No risk of Korean war—stake are too high

McClatchy 10 [MCCLATCHY WASHINGTON BUREAU | BY WARREN P. STROBEL AND JONATHAN S. LANDAY, “Experts say war unlikely North, South Korea” May 25]

Although the isolated, communist North's behavior is notoriously unpredictable and sometimes seems irrational, all-out war between it and the democratic, capitalist South still seems unlikely, analysts said, given the stakes. Nevertheless, tensions on the Korean peninsula, where some 28,500 U.S. troops provide a tripwire for U.S. military intervention if the North attacks, are likely to rise in coming days. North Korea would likely lose any conflict with the South, but not before inflicting massive damage on South Korea's capital, Seoul, a 30-minute drive south of the demilitarized zone that has divided the two Koreas since 1953. U.S. intelligence officials estimate that some 11,000 North Korean artillery pieces are in sheltered positions within range of Seoul and probably could destroy much of the city before they could be knocked out. "The tensions certainly have increased," but there is no sign that North Korea is mobilizing its 1.2 million-strong military, said a U.S. defense official, who requested anonymity in order to speak more freely. "They have masses (of troops) down on the DMZ (demilitarized zone), but they do a normal shift or rotation," he said. South Korean officials said they were bracing for fresh provocations from the North, especially at sea. On Monday, South Korean President Lee Myung-bak blamed North Korea for the March 26 sinking of the corvette Cheonan, which killed 46 of its crew, and said he was curbing trade with North Korea and banning its ships from transiting South Korean waters. "That could get sort of ugly if (North Korean vessels) don't stop, and chances are they won't," said Art Brown, formerly the top U.S. intelligence analyst for East Asia. "It's unlikely they will do nothing. I tend to think they're not going to try Korean War, version two." Still, Brown and other former top U.S. officials said that serious clashes between the Koreas during the past 57 years haven't led to warfare -- and sometimes have provided opportunities for rapprochement.

No escalation – empirical

Strobel and Landay, 10 – Foreign affairs correspondent, reporter (Warren and Jonathan, 5/25/10, Yahoo News, “Will North Korea's saber rattling lead to war?” <http://news.yahoo.com/s/mcclatchy/20100525/wl_mcclatchy/3516222>)

"It's not inevitable that it will escalate," said Mitchell Reiss , who negotiated with North Korea during the Clinton administration. Reiss said no war erupted after earlier North Korean acts that were more provocative than the sinking of the Cheonan was. Those included a 1983 bombing linked to North Korea that killed South Korean cabinet members who were visiting Burma and a 1968 commando raid on the South Korean presidential residence, the Blue House. Lee also "didn't shoot all of his bullets, and he left some incentives on the table for the North Koreans to behave better in the future," Reiss said, pointing to Lee's decision not to pull out of a joint industrial park in the northern border town of Kaesong.

Won’t escalate to full scale conflict

Paal, 10 – vice president for studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (6/3/10, Douglas H., “The Cheonan Attack,” http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23472]

One thing we have observed about Kim Jong-il and the North Koreans: they do not let defeats go unanswered. After the loss of the North Korean ship, the commander of its component, known as Unit 586, General Kim Myung-guk, was demoted to three-star rank. But on April 25 this year, a month after the torpedo sank the South’s Cheonan, Kim received his fourth star again, personally from the Dear Leader. This strongly suggests both a desire for vengeance and a need for the North’s leader to maintain his close connection to the armed forces. We have to assume that the North’s commanders believed they could pull this operation off without being clearly implicated, even though they would be widely suspected to be responsible. After all, would not the torpedo destroy itself and the evidence would sink to the bottom of the sea? This was intended to reduce the chances that the North would be forced to pay a price directly. And it would give voice to dissidents in the South to criticize and oppose the new Lee Myung-bak government, a consistent goal of the North. Now, North Korea and its friends have been surprised by the clear evidence that it was guilty of launching the attack. The quality and integrity of the evidence assembled by the South and its international advisors have thrown Pyongyang (and Beijing) on the defensive. Both North and South have begun the process of sanctioning and threatening each other, though **with discernible limits which signal intent to avoid outright conflict.**

Delay CP card

Delay CP: do the plan after the deadline—solves the debt ceiling link

State Column 7/4 (“Debt Limit Debate May Face Filibuster Challenge From Sen. Rand Paul,” <http://www.thestatecolumn.com/articles/debt-limit-debate-may-face-filibuster-challenge-from-sen-rand-paul/>)

A number of leading Republicans, including South Carolina U.S. Senator Jim DeMint, have called on members of Congress to pass the proposal, noting that any Republicans voting in favor of a proposal without the amendment will face challenges in 2012. “[W]e will actually vote in favor of raising the debt ceiling next week if we can, but it will be contingent on passing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution,” the Kentucky Republican said. Mr. Paul’s comment comes as President Obama and Congressional Democrats are preparing to launch full-scale negotiations this week as an August 2 deadline for a deal is quickly approaching. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner said Friday that Congress will have to agree to a proposal by July 22, noting the need to craft a measure and pass it by early August. Both Democrats and Republicans used the holiday weekend to stake out positions in the debate, with each side criticizing and blaming the other for the current stalemate. “We have a deadline — August 2nd. As of August 2nd, if the debt ceiling is not extended, we will see a dramatic negative impact on America and the global economy,” Illinois U.S. Senator Dick Durbin said. “The eyes of the world are fixed on the U.S. to see if we have the political courage and moral sense to solve our debt crisis,” Indiana U.S. Senator Dan Coats said in response.